arXiv:math/0206012v1 [math.AG] 3 Jun 2002

Surface group representations, Higgs bundles, and holomorphic triples

Steven B. Bradlow[1,2]
Department of Mathematics,
University of Illinois,
Urbana, IL 61801, USA
E-mail: `bradlow@math.uiuc.edu`

Oscar García–Prada[1,3,5,6]
Departamento de Matemáticas,
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid,
28049 Madrid, Spain
E-mail: `oscar.garcia-prada@uam.es`

Peter B. Gothen[1,4,5]
Departamento de Matemática Pura,
Faculdade de Ciências, Universidade do Porto,
Rua do Campo Alegre 687, 4169-007 Porto, Portugal
E-mail: `pbgothen@fc.up.pt`

June 3, 2002

---

[1] Members of VBAC (Vector Bundles on Algebraic Curves), which is partially supported by EAGER (EC FP5 Contract no. HPRN-CT-2000-00099) and by EDGE (EC FP5 Contract no. HPRN-CT-2000-00101).

[2] Partially supported by the National Science Foundation under grant DMS-0072073

[3] Partially supported by the Ministerio de Ciencia y Tecnología (Spain) under grant BFM2000-0024

[4] Partially supported by the Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (Portugal) through the Centro de Matemática da Universidade do Porto and through grant no. SFRH/BPD/1606/2000.

[5] Partially supported by the Portugal/Spain bilateral Programme Acciones Integradas, grant nos. HP2000-0015 and AI-01/24

[6] Partially supported by a British EPSRC grant (October-December 2001)

Abstract. Using the L^2 norm of the Higgs field as a Morse function, we study the moduli spaces of $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundles over a Riemann surface. We require that the genus of the surface be at least two, but place no constraints on (p,q). A key step is the identification of the function's local minima as moduli spaces of holomorphic triples. We prove that these moduli spaces of triples are irreducible and non-empty.

Because of the relation between flat bundles and fundamental group representations, we can interpret our conclusions as results about the number of connected components in the moduli space of semisimple $\mathrm{PU}(p,q)$-representations. The topological invariants of the flat bundles bundle are used to label components. These invariants are bounded by a Milnor–Wood type inequality. For each allowed value of the invariants satisfying a certain coprimality condition, we prove that the corresponding component is non-empty and connected. If the coprimality condition does not hold, our results apply to the irreducible representations.

Contents

1 Introduction 1

2 Representations of surface groups 10

2.1 Definitions 10

2.2 Invariants on $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(\mathrm{U}(p,q))$ and relation to $\mathcal{R}(\mathrm{PU}(p,q))$ 13

3 Higgs bundles and flat connections 14

3.1 $\mathrm{GL}(n)$-Higgs bundles 14

3.2 $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundles 16

3.3 Deformation theory of Higgs bundles 20

3.4 Bounds on the topological invariants 21

3.5 Moduli space for $p = q$ and $|\tau| = \tau_M$ 24

3.6 Rigidity for extreme values of the Toledo invariant 24

4 Morse theory 26

4.1 The Morse function 26

4.2 Critical points of the Morse function 27

4.3 Local minima and the adjoint bundle 30

4.4 Stable Higgs bundles 32

4.5 Reducible Higgs bundles 34

4.6 Local minima and connectedness 38

5 Stable triples 39

5.1 Definitions and basic facts 39

5.2 Minima as triples 44

5.3 Extensions and deformations of triples 48

6 Crossing critical values 53

6.1 Flip Loci 53

6.2 Codimension Estimates 58

6.3 Holomorphic chains 61

6.4 Estimate of $\chi(\mathbf{n}'', \mathbf{d}'', \mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}')$ and comparison of moduli spaces . 67

7 Special values of α 69

7.1 The kernel of ϕ and the parameter α 69

7.2 The cokernel of ϕ and the parameter α 72

8 Moduli space of triples with $n_1 \neq n_2$ 73

8.1 Moduli space for $\alpha = \alpha_M$ 73

8.2 Moduli space for large α 74

8.3 Moduli space for $2g - 2 \leqslant \alpha < \alpha_M$ 80

9 Moduli space of triples with $n_1 = n_2$ 81

9.1 Moduli space for $d_1 = d_2$ 81

9.2 Bounds on E_1 and E_2 for $\alpha > \alpha_0$ 82

9.3 Stabilization of moduli 83

9.4 Moduli for large α and $\alpha \geqslant 2g - 2$ 86

10 Existence and connectedness for $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$ and $\mathrm{PU}(p,q)$ moduli spaces 90

10.1 Toledo invariant and the number of components 91

10.2 Genericity of 2g-2 and coprimality conditions 92

10.3 Moduli spaces of $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundles 95

10.4 Moduli spaces of $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$ and $\mathrm{PU}(p,q)$ representations 98

References 100

1 Introduction

The core of this paper is a Morse theoretic study of the the moduli space of $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundles over a Riemann surface X of genus $g \geqslant 2$. Our interest in this space comes from two sources. The first is its relevance to questions concerning the representation variety for representations of $\pi_1 X$ in the real Lie group $\mathrm{PU}(p,q)$. The second has to do with the intrinsic geometry revealed by the Morse function and the methods we are able to use to carry out our analysis. Our main goals are to fully understand the minimal submanifolds of the Morse function and, thereby, to count the number of connected components in the representation varieties.

A Higgs bundle consists of a holomorphic bundle together with a Higgs field, i.e. a section of a certain associated vector bundle. A $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundle is a special case of the G-Higgs bundles defined by Hitchin in [23], where G is a real form of a complex reductive Lie group. Such objects provide a natural generalization of holomorphic vector bundles, which correspond to the case $G = \mathrm{U}(n)$ and zero Higgs field. In particular, they permit an extension to other groups of the Narasimhan and Seshadri theorem ([28]) on the relation between unitary representations of $\pi_1 X$ and stable vector bundles.

By embedding $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$ in $\mathrm{GL}(p+q)$ we can give a concrete description of a $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundle as a pair

$$(V \oplus W, \Phi = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & \beta \\ \gamma & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right))$$

where V and W are holomorphic vector bundles of rank p and q respectively, β is a section in $H^0(\mathrm{Hom}(W,V) \otimes K)$, and $\gamma \in H^0(\mathrm{Hom}(V,W) \otimes K)$, so that $\Phi \in H^0(\mathrm{End}(V \oplus W) \otimes K)$. Foremost among the key features of such objects is (by the work of Hitchin, [23, 24] Donaldson [12], Corlette [10] and Simpson [31, 32, 33, 34]) the existence of moduli spaces of polystable objects which can be identified with moduli spaces of solutions to natural gauge theoretic equations. Moreover, since the gauge theory equations amount to a projective flatness condition, these moduli spaces correspond with a moduli spaces of flat structures. In the case of $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundles, the flat structures correspond to semisimple representations of $\pi_1 X$ into the group $\mathrm{PU}(p,q)$. The Higgs bundle moduli spaces can thus be used, in a way which we make precise in Sections 2 and 3, as a tool to study the representation variety

$$\mathcal{R}(\mathrm{PU}(p,q)) = \mathrm{Hom}^+(\pi_1 X, \mathrm{PU}(p,q))/\mathrm{PU}(p,q)\ ,$$

where $\mathrm{Hom}^+(\pi_1 X, \mathrm{PU}(p,q))$ denotes the semisimple representations into $\mathrm{PU}(p,q)$ and the the quotient is by the adjoint action.

This relation between Higgs bundles and surface group representations has been successfully exploited by others, going back originally to the work of Hitchin and Simpson on complex reductive groups. The use of Higgs bundle methods to study representation variety $\mathcal{R}(G)$ for real G was pioneered by Hitchin in [24], and further developed in [18, 19] and by Xia and Xia-Markman in [37, 38, 39, 26]. Where we differ from these works is that in none of them is the general case of $\mathrm{PU}(p, q)$ considered. What we have in common is that in all cases insight into the topology of the space $\mathcal{R}(G)$ comes from a natural Morse function on the corresponding moduli space of Higgs bundles.

The natural Morse function measures the L^2-norm of the Higgs field. This turns out to provide a suitably non-degenerate Morse function which is, moreover, a proper map. In some cases (cf. [23, 18]) all the critical submanifolds are sufficiently well understood so as to permit the extraction of detailed topological information such as the Poincaré polynomial. In our case our understanding is confined mostly to the submanifolds corresponding to the local minima of the Morse function. Fortunately, this is sufficient for our purposes, namely to understand the number of components of the Higgs moduli spaces, and thus of the representation varieties.

The Morse function is non-negative but cannot always attain its zero lower bound. For $\mathrm{GL}(n)$-Higgs bundles, this lower bound is attained, with the minimizing points in the moduli space consisting of semistable vector bundles with zero Higgs field. However in the case of $\mathrm{U}(p, q)$-Higgs bundles, the special form of the underlying holomorphic bundle prevents a polystable Higgs bundle from having a vanishing Higgs field. The minimizers of the Morse function thus have a more complicated structure than simply that of a stable bundle. Generalizing the results in [18, 19], we show that any minimizer consists of a pair of bundles together with a morphism between them. That is, the minimizers correspond precisely to a special case of the holomorphic triples introduced in [6].

The holomorphic triples admit moduli spaces of stable objects in their own right. In order to exploit the relation between these spaces and the minimal submanifolds in the moduli spaces of $\mathrm{U}(p, q)$-Higgs bundles, we need a sufficiently good understanding of the triples moduli spaces. A substantial part of this paper is devoted to acquiring just such an understanding. The way we acquire the needed information is similar in spirit to techniques used by Thaddeus in [35]. The key idea (described fully in sections 5 and 6) is that the moduli spaces of triples come in discrete families, with the members of the families ordered by intervals in the range of a continuously varying real parameter. As the parameter moves to the large extreme of its range, the structure of the corresponding moduli spaces simplify and we can obtain a detailed description. Moreover, as the parameter decreases, we can track, albeit somewhat crudely, how the moduli spaces change. Combining these pieces of data, we get just enough information about the moduli space of relevance to our Higgs bundle problem.

We now give a brief summary of the contents and main results of this paper.

In Sections 2 and 3 we give some background and describe the basic objects of our study. In Sections 2 we describe the natural invariants associated with representations of $\pi_1 X$ into $\mathrm{PU}(p,q)$. We also discuss the invariants associated with representations of Γ, the universal central extensions of π_1, into $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$. In both cases, these involve a pair of integers (a,b) which can be interpreted respectively as degrees of rank p and rank q vector bundles over X. In the case of the $\mathrm{PU}(p,q)$ representations, the pair is well defined only as a class in a quotient $\mathbb{Z}\oplus\mathbb{Z}/(p,q)\mathbb{Z}$. This leads us to define subspaces $\mathcal{R}[a,b]\subset\mathcal{R}(\mathrm{PU}(p,q))$ and $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(a,b)\subset\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(\mathrm{U}(p,q))$. For fixed (a,b), the space $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(a,b)$ fibers over $\mathcal{R}[a,b]$ with connected fibers.

In section 3 we give precise definitions of the $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundles and their moduli spaces and establish their essential properties. Thinking of a $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundle as a pair $(V\oplus W,\Phi)$, the parameters (a,b) appear here as the degrees of the bundles V and W. We denote the moduli space of polystable $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundles with $\deg(V)=a$ and $\deg W=b$ by $\mathcal{M}(a,b)$, and identify $\mathcal{M}(a,b)$ with the component $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(a,b)$ of $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(\mathrm{U}(p,q))$. This, together with the fibration over $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(\mathrm{U}(p,q))$ are the crucial links between the Higgs moduli and the surface group representation varieties.

Except for the last section, where we translate back to the language of representation varieties, the rest of the paper is concerned with the spaces $\mathcal{M}(a,b)$. Fixing p,q,a and b, we begin the Morse theoretic analysis of $\mathcal{M}(a,b)$ in Section 4. Using the L^2-norm of the Higgs field $\Phi=\left(\begin{smallmatrix}0&\beta\\ \gamma&0\end{smallmatrix}\right)$ as the Morse function, the basic result we need (cf. Proposition 4.2) is that this function has a minimum on each connected component of $\mathcal{M}(a,b)$, and if the subspace of local minima is connected then so is $\mathcal{M}(a,b)$. The next step is to identify the local minima, the loci of which we denote by $\mathcal{N}(a,b)$. We prove (cf. Propositions 4.10 and 4.15) that these correspond precisely to the polystable Higgs bundles in which $\beta=0$ or $\gamma=0$. The data defining a Higgs bundle with $\beta=0$ can thus be written as the triple $(W\otimes K,V,\gamma)$. Similarly, the $\gamma=0$ minima correspond to triples $(V\otimes K,W,\beta)$. This brings us to the theory of such holomorphic triples.

In sections 5-9 we develop the theory we need concerning holomorphic triples and their moduli spaces. While only triples of a specific special kind correspond to the minima on the $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs moduli, we develop the theory for the general case in which a holomorphic triple is specified by the set $T = (E_1, E_2, \phi)$, where E_1 and E_2 are holomorphic bundles on X and $\phi\colon E_2 \to E_1$ is holomorphic (see [15] and [6]). There is a notion of stability for triples which depends on a real parameter α and there are moduli spaces of α-polystable triples, which are shown in [6] (see also [15]) to be projective varieties. In order for $\mathcal{N}_\alpha$ to be non-empty, one must have $\alpha \geqslant \alpha_m$ with $\alpha_m = d_1/n_1 - d_2/n_2 \geqslant 0$. In the case $n_1 \neq n_2$ there is also a finite upper bound α_M. When the parameter α varies, the nature of the α-stability condition only changes for a discrete number of so-called *critical values* of α (see section 5.1 for the precise statements). We denote by

$$\mathcal{N}_\alpha = \mathcal{N}_\alpha(n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2)$$

the moduli space of α-polystable triples with $\mathrm{rk}(E_i) = n_i$ and $\deg(E_i) = d_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. The subspace of α-stable triples inside $\mathcal{N}_\alpha$, denoted by $\mathcal{N}_\alpha^s$, is a quasi-projective variety. In Theorem 5.21 we show that

Theorem. *$\mathcal{N}_\alpha^s$ is smooth for all values of α greater than or equal to $2g-2$.*

We show furthermore that the triples which appear in $\mathcal{N}(a,b)$ are α-polystable with $\alpha = 2g-2$. We must thus understand a moduli space of α-stable triples, with α on the boundary of the range in which the moduli spaces are smooth. We do this indirectly, by obtaining a description of $\mathcal{N}_\alpha^s$ when α is large and then examining how the moduli space changes as α decreases.

In section 6 we examine how the moduli spaces differ for values of α on opposite sides of a critical value. If $\mathcal{N}_{\alpha_c^\pm}$ denote the moduli spaces for values of α above and below a critical value α_c, we denote the loci along which they differ by $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_c^\pm}$ respectively. Our main results are

Theorem (Theorem 6.19). *Let $\alpha_c \in (\alpha_m, \alpha_M)$ be a critical value for triples of type (n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2). If $\alpha_c > 2g-2$ then the loci $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_c^\pm} \subset \mathcal{N}^s_{\alpha_c^\pm}$ are contained in subvarieties of codimension at least $g-1$. In particular, they are contained in subvarieties of strictly positive codimension if $g \geqslant 2$. If $\alpha_c = 2g-2$ then the same is true for $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_c^+}$.*

Theorem (Corollary 6.20). *Let α_1 and α_2 be any two values in (α_m, α_M) such that $\alpha_m < \alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \alpha_M$ and $2g-2 \leqslant \alpha_1$. Then*

- *The moduli spaces $\mathcal{N}^s_{\alpha_1}$ and $\mathcal{N}^s_{\alpha_2}$ have the same number of connected components, and*

- *The moduli space* $\mathcal{N}_{\alpha_1}^s$ *is irreducible if and only if* $\mathcal{N}_{\alpha_2}^s$ *is.*

Where by α_M we denote the upper bound for α if $n_1 \neq n_2$, or ∞ if $n_1 = n_2$.

In sections 7-9 we look more closely at how the parameter α affects the nature of α-stable triples. There are three cases to consider, namely $n_1 < n_2$, $n_1 > n_2$ and $n_1 = n_2$. However, using a duality result, it is enough to consider $n_1 > n_2$ and $n_1 = n_2$. In the first case, as mentioned above, there is a bounded interval $[\alpha_m, \alpha_M]$ outside of which $\mathcal{N}_\alpha$ is empty. Within this interval we identify a number of special values beyond which the structure of α-stable triples simplify; by Corollary 7.3 the map $\phi : E_2 \to E_1$ is injective if $\alpha > \alpha_0$, by Proposition 7.5 the cokernel is torsion free. Finally, for the largest values of α, i.e. for values greater than a bound which we denote by α_L, we show (cf. Proposition 8.3) that α-stable triples have the form

$$0 \longrightarrow E_2 \xrightarrow{\phi} E_1 \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow 0,$$

with F locally free, and E_2 and F semistable. This leads to a description of $\mathcal{N}_\alpha$ for any α in the range $\alpha_L < \alpha < \alpha_M$. Denoting this moduli space by $\mathcal{N}_L$, we get

Theorem (Theorem 8.7). *Let* $n_1 > n_2$ *and* $d_1/n_1 > d_2/n_2$*.*

The moduli space $\mathcal{N}_L^s(n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2)$ *is smooth, and is birationally equivalent to a* $\mathbb{P}^N$*-fibration over* $M^s(n_1 - n_2, d_1 - d_2) \times M^s(n_2, d_2)$*, where* $M^s(n, d)$ *denotes the moduli space of stable bundles of degree* n *and rank* d*, and the fiber dimension is* $N = n_2 d_1 - n_1 d_2 + n_1(n_1 - n_2)(g - 1) - 1$*. In particular,* $\mathcal{N}_L^s(n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2)$ *is non-empty and irreducible. If* $\mathrm{GCD}(n_1 - n_2, d_1 - d_2) = 1$ *and* $\mathrm{GCD}(n_2, d_2) = 1$*, the birational equivalence is an isomorphism.*

Moreover, $\mathcal{N}_L(n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2)$ *is irreducible and hence birationally equivalent to* $\mathcal{N}_L^s(n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2)$*.*

Theorem (Theorem 8.9, Corollary 8.10). *Let* α *be any value in the range* $2g - 2 \leqslant \alpha < \alpha_M$*. Then* $\mathcal{N}_\alpha^s$ *is birationally equivalent to* $\mathcal{N}_L^s$*. In particular it is non-empty and irreducible.*

Let (n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2) *be such that* $\mathrm{GCD}(n_2, n_1 + n_2, d_1 + d_2) = 1$*. If* α *is generic then* $\mathcal{N}_\alpha$ *is birationally equivalent to* $\mathcal{N}_L$*, and in particular it is irreducible.*

The case $n_1 = n_2$ differs from the $n_1 > n_2$ case in two ways. The range for α is unbounded above, and in general there is no way to avoid torsion in the cokernel of the map ϕ. The range for α presents no difficulties since (cf. Theorem 9.5) beyond a finite bound there are no changes in the moduli spaces. It thus still makes sense to identify a 'large α moduli space, $\mathcal{N}_L$'. We prove the following.

Theorem (Theorem 9.13). *The moduli space* $\mathcal{N}_L(n,n,d_1,d_2)$ *is non-empty and irreducible. Moreover, it is birationally equivalent to a* $\mathbb{P}^N$*-fibration over* $M^s(n,d_2)\times \mathrm{Div}^d(X)$*, where the fiber dimension is* $N=n(d_1-d_2)-1$.

Theorem (Theorem 9.14). *If* $\alpha \geqslant 2g-2$ *then the moduli space* $\mathcal{N}^s_\alpha(n,n,d_1,d_2)$ *is birationally equivalent to* $\mathcal{N}_L(n,n,d_1,d_2)$ *and hence non-empty and irreducible. Moreover,* $\mathcal{N}_\alpha(n,n,d_1,d_2)$ *is birationally equivalent to* $\mathcal{N}_L(n,n,d_1,d_2)$*, and hence irreducible, if also*

- $\mathrm{GCD}(n,2n,d_1+d_2)=1$ *and* $\alpha\geqslant 2g-2$ *is generic, or*
- $d_1-d_2<\alpha$*,*

In section 10 we apply our results to the moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}(a,b)$, and hence to the components $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(a,b)$ and $\mathcal{R}[a,b]$ of the representation varieties $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(\mathrm{U}(p,q))$ and $\mathcal{R}(\mathrm{PU}(p,q))$, respectively. Some of the results depend only on the combination

$$\tau=\tau(a,b)=2\frac{aq-bp}{p+q}\ ,$$

known as the Toledo invariant. Indeed, (a,b) is constrained by the bounds $0\leqslant|\tau|\leqslant\tau_M$, where $\tau_M=2\min\{p,q\}(g-1)$. Originally proved by Domic and Toledo in [11], these bounds emerge naturally from our point of view (cf. Corollary 3.21 and Remark 5.13). After a discussion (in Section 10.1) of the relation between (a,b) and τ, and (in section 10.2) of the significance of the coprime condition $\mathrm{GCD}(p+q,a+b)=1$, we assemble (in section 10.3) our results for the Higgs Moduli spaces. Summarizing the results of section 10.3 into one Theorem, we get

Theorem. *Let* (a,b) *be such that* $|\tau(a,b)|\leqslant\tau_M$*. Unless further restrictions are imposed, let* (p,q) *be any pair of positive integers.*

(1) *If either of the following sets of conditions apply, then the moduli space* $\mathcal{M}^s(a,b)$ *is a non-empty, smooth manifold of the expected dimension, with connected closure* $\bar{\mathcal{M}}^s(a,b)$*:*

  (*i*) $0<|\tau(a,b)|<\tau_M$,

  (*ii*) $|\tau(a,b)|=\tau_M$ *and* $p=q$

(2) *If any one of the following sets of conditions apply, then the moduli space* $\mathcal{M}(a,b)$ *is non-empty and connected:*

  (*i*) $\tau(a,b) = 0$,

  (*ii*) $|\tau(a,b)| = \tau_M$ *and* $p \neq q$. ,

  (*iii*) $(p-1)(2g-2) < |\tau| \leqslant \tau_M = p(2g-2)$ *and* $p = q$,

  (*iv*) $\mathrm{GCD}(p+q, a+b) = 1$

(3) *If* $|\tau(a,b)| = \tau_M$ *and* $p \neq q$ *then any element in* $\mathcal{M}(a,b)$ *is strictly semistable (i.e.* $\mathcal{M}^s(a,b)$ *is empty). If* $p < q$*, then any such representation decomposes as a direct sum of a* $\mathrm{U}(p,p)$*-Higgs bundle with maximal Toledo invariant and a polystable vector bundle of rank* $q-p$*. Thus, if* $\tau = p(2g-2)$ *then there is an isomorphism*

$$\mathcal{M}(p,q,a,b) \cong \mathcal{M}(p,p,a,a-p(2g-2)) \times M(q-p, b-a+p(2g-2)),$$

where the notation $\mathcal{M}(p,q,a,b)$ *indicates the moduli space of* $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$*-Higgs bundles with invariants* (a,b)*, and* $M(n,d)$ *is the moduli space of semistable vector bundles of rank* n *and degree* d*. (A similar result holds if* $p > q$*, as well as if* $\tau = -p(2g-2)$*).*

(4) *If* $\mathrm{GCD}(p+q, a+b) = 1$ *then* $\mathcal{M}(a,b)$ *is a smooth manifold of the expected dimension.*

Translating this into the language of representations of Γ and the fundamental group, we get the following.

Theorem (Theorem 10.18). *Let* (a,b) *be such that* $|\tau(a,b)| \leqslant \tau_M$*. Unless further restrictions are imposed, let* (p,q) *be any pair of positive integers.*

(1) *If either of the following sets of conditions apply, then the moduli space* $\mathcal{R}^*_\Gamma(a,b)$ *of irreducible semi-simple representations, is a non-empty, smooth manifold of the expected dimension, with connected closure* $\bar{\mathcal{R}}^*_\Gamma(a,b)$*:*

  (*i*) $0 < |\tau(a,b)| < \tau_M$,

  (*ii*) $|\tau(a,b)| = \tau_M$ *and* $p = q$

(2) *If any one of the following sets of conditions apply, then the moduli space* $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(a,b)$ *of all semi-simple representations is non-empty and connected:*

(*i*) $\tau(a,b)=0$,

(*ii*) $|\tau(a,b)|=\tau_M$ *and* $p\neq q$. ,

(*iii*) $(p-1)(2g-2)<|\tau|\leqslant\tau_M=p(2g-2)$ *and* $p=q$,

(*iv*) $\mathrm{GCD}(p+q,a+b)=1$

(3) *If* $|\tau(a,b)|=\tau_M$ *and* $p\neq q$ *then any representation in* $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(a,b)$ *is reducible (i.e.* $\mathcal{R}^*_\Gamma(a,b)$ *is empty). If* $p<q$*, then any such representation decomposes as a direct sum of a semisimple representation of* Γ *in* $\mathrm{U}(p,p)$ *with maximal Toledo invariant and a semisimple representation in* $\mathrm{U}(q-p)$*. Thus, if* $\tau=p(2g-2)$ *then there is an isomorphism*

$$\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(p,q,a,b)\cong\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(p,p,a,a-p(2g-2))\times R_\Gamma(q-p,b-a+p(2g-2)),$$

where the notation $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(p,q,a,b)$ *indicates the moduli space of representations of* Γ *in* $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$ *with invariants* (a,b)*, and* $R_\Gamma(n,d)$ *denotes the moduli space of degree* d *representations of* Γ *in* $\mathrm{U}(n)$*. (A similar result holds if* $p>q$*, as well as if* $\tau=-p(2g-2)$*).*

(4) *If* $\mathrm{GCD}(p+q,a+b)=1$ *then* $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(a,b)$ *is a smooth manifold of the expected dimension.*

Theorem (Theorem 10.19). *Let* (a,b) *be such that* $|\tau(a,b)|\leqslant\tau_M$*. Unless further restrictions are imposed, let* (p,q) *be any pair of positive integers.*

(1) *If either of the following sets of conditions apply, then the moduli space* $\mathcal{R}^*[a,b]$ *of irreducible semi-simple representations, is non-empty, with connected closure* $\bar{\mathcal{R}}^*[a,b]$*:*

(*i*) $0<|\tau(a,b)|<\tau_M$,

(*ii*) $|\tau(a,b)|=\tau_M$ *and* $p=q$

(2) *If any one of the following sets of conditions apply, then the moduli space* $\mathcal{R}[a,b]$ *of all semi-simple representations is non-empty and connected:*

(*i*) $\tau(a,b)=0$,

(*ii*) $|\tau(a,b)|=\tau_M$ *and* $p\neq q$. ,

(*iii*) $(p-1)(2g-2)<|\tau|\leqslant\tau_M=p(2g-2)$ *and* $p=q$,

(*iv*) $\mathrm{GCD}(p+q,a+b)=1$

(3) *If* $|\tau(a,b)| = \tau_M$ *and* $p \neq q$ *then any representation in* $\mathcal{R}[a,b]$ *is reducible (i.e.* $\mathcal{R}^*[a,b]$ *is empty). If* $p < q$*, then any such representation reduces to a semisimple representation of* $\pi_1 X$ *in* $\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{U}(p,p) \times \mathrm{U}(q-p))$*, such that the representation in* $\mathrm{PU}(p,p)$ *induced via projection on the first factor has maximal Toledo invariant. (A similar result holds if* $p > q$*, as well as if* $\tau = -p(2g-2)$*).*

Statement (3) in the previous theorem is a generalization to arbitrary (p,q) of a result of D. Toledo [36] when $p = 1$ and L. Hernández [22] when $p = 2$. This rigidity phenomenon for the moduli space of representations for the largest value of the Toledo invariant turns out to be of significance in relation to Hitchin's Teichmüller components for the real split form of a complex group [24] (this will be discussed somewhere else [16]).

We note, finally, that our methods clearly have wider applicability than to the $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundles and representations into $\mathrm{PU}(p,q)$. A careful scrutiny of the Lie algebra properties used in our proofs suggests a generalization to any real group G for which G/K is hermitian symmetric, where $K \subset G$ is a maximal compact subgroup. This will be addressed in a future publication.

The main results proved in this paper were announced in the note [7]. In that note we claim that the connectedness results hold for the moduli spaces $\mathcal{R}(a,b)$ and $\mathcal{R}[a,b]$, whether or not the coprimality condition $\mathrm{GCD}(p+q, a+b) = 1$ is satisfied (and similarly for the corresponding moduli of triples and $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundles). While we expect this to be true, we have not so far been able to prove it. We hope to come back to this question in a future publication.

Acknowledgements. We thank the mathematics departments of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the Universidad Autónoma de Madrid and the University of Aarhus, the Department of Pure Mathematics of the University of Porto, the Mathematical Sciences Research Institute of Berkeley and the Mathematical Institute of the University of Oxford for their hospitality during various stages of this research. We thank Ron Donagi, Bill Goldman, Tomás Gómez, Rafael Hernández, Nigel Hitchin, Alastair King, Eyal Markman, Vicente Muñoz, Peter Newstead, S. Ramanan, Domingo Toledo, and Eugene Xia, for many insights and patient explanations.

2 Representations of surface groups

2.1 Definitions

Let X be a closed oriented surface of genus $g \geqslant 2$ and let G be either $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$ or $\mathrm{PU}(p,q)$ where p and q are any positive integers. We think of $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$ as the subgroup of $\mathrm{GL}(n)$ (with $n = p+q$) which leaves invariant a hermitian form of signature (p,q). It is a non-compact real form of $\mathrm{GL}(n)$ with center S^1 and maximal compact subgroup $\mathrm{U}(p) \times \mathrm{U}(q)$. The quotient $\mathrm{U}(p,q)/\mathrm{U}(p) \times \mathrm{U}(q)$ is a hermitian symmetric space. The adjoint form $\mathrm{PU}(p,q)$ is given by the exacts sequence of groups

$$1 \longrightarrow \mathrm{U}(1) \longrightarrow \mathrm{U}(p,q) \longrightarrow \mathrm{PU}(p,q) \longrightarrow 1.$$

By a representation of $\pi_1 X$ in G we mean a homomorphism $\rho\colon \pi_1 X \to G$. Fixing $\mathrm{PU}(p,q) \subset \mathrm{PGL}(n)$, we say a representation of $\pi_1 X$ in $\mathrm{PU}(p,q)$ is semi-simple if it defines a semi-simple $\mathrm{PGL}(n)$ representation. The group $\mathrm{PU}(p,q)$ acts on the set of representations via conjugation. Restricting to the semi-simple representations, we get the character variety,

$$\mathcal{R}(\mathrm{PU}(p,q)) = \mathrm{Hom}^{+}(\pi_1 X, \mathrm{PU}(p,q))/\mathrm{PU}(p,q). \tag{2.1}$$

This can be described as follows: from the standard presentation

$$\pi_1 X = \langle A_1, B_1, \dots, A_g, B_g \mid \prod_{i=1}^{g} [A_i, B_i] = 1 \rangle$$

we see that $\mathrm{Hom}^{+}(\pi_1 X, \mathrm{PU}(p,q))$ can be embedded in $\mathrm{PU}(p,q)^{2g}$ via

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Hom}^{+}(\pi_1 X, \mathrm{PU}(p,q)) &\to \mathrm{PU}(p,q)^{2g} \\ \rho &\mapsto (\rho(A_1), \dots \rho(B_g)). \end{aligned}$$

We give $\mathrm{Hom}^{+}(\pi_1 X, \mathrm{PU}(p,q))$ the subspace topology and $\mathcal{R}(\mathrm{PU}(p,q))$ the quotient topology; this is Hausdorff because we have restricted attention to semi-simple representations. We can similarly define

$$\mathcal{R}_{\Gamma}(\mathrm{U}(p,q)) = \mathrm{Hom}^{+}(\Gamma, \mathrm{U}(p,q))/\mathrm{U}(p,q), \tag{2.2}$$

where Γ is the central extension

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z} \longrightarrow \Gamma \longrightarrow \pi_1 X \longrightarrow 1 \tag{2.3}$$

defined (as in [3]) by the generators $A_1, B_1, \dots, A_g, B_g$ and a central element J subject to the relation $\prod_{i=1}^{g} [A_i, B_i] = J$. Regarding $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$ as a subset of $\mathrm{GL}(n)$, the representations in $\mathrm{Hom}^+(\Gamma, \mathrm{U}(p,q))$ are direct sums of irreducible representations on $\mathbb{C}^n$. The first step in the study of the topological properties of $\mathcal{R}(G)$ is to identify the appropriate topological invariants of a representation $\rho\colon \pi_1 X \to G$. To do that, one uses the correspondence between representations of $\pi_1 X$ in G and flat principal G-bundles on X. We start with $G = \mathrm{PU}(p,q)$. Let $\rho\colon \pi_1 X \to \mathrm{PU}(p,q)$ be a representation. The corresponding flat principal $\mathrm{PU}(p,q)$-bundle is

$$P_\rho = \tilde{X} \times_\rho \mathrm{PU}(p,q),$$

where $\tilde{X}$ is the universal cover of X. Since X has real dimension two, any $\mathrm{PU}(p,q)$-bundle lifts to a $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-bundle. Moreover, a $\mathrm{PU}(p,q)$-bundle with a flat connection can be lifted to a $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-bundle with a projectively flat connection, i.e. with a connection with constant central curvature. Now, for any smooth (not necessarily flat) $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-bundle there is a reduction of structure group to the maximal compact subgroup $\mathrm{U}(p) \times \mathrm{U}(q)$. Taking the standard representation on $\mathbb{C}^p \oplus \mathbb{C}^q$, we get an associated vector bundle of the form $V \oplus W$, where V and W are rank p and q complex vector bundles respectively. Such bundles over a Riemann surface are topologically classified by a pair of integers

$$(a,b) = (\deg(V), \deg(W)).$$

The lift to a $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-bundle, and therefore the pair (a,b), is however not uniquely determined. If we twist the associated vector bundle (plus projectively flat connection) by a line bundle L with a connection with constant curvature, then after projectivizing we obtain the same flat $\mathrm{PU}(p,q)$-bundle. If the degree of L is l then the invariant associated to the twisted bundle is $(a+pl, b+ql)$. In order to obtain a well defined invariant for the representation ρ we must thus take the quotient of $(\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z})$ by the $\mathbb{Z}$-action $l \cdot (a,b) = (a+pl, b+ql)$, i.e. we must pass to the quotient $(\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z})/(p,q)\mathbb{Z}$ in the exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z} \to (\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z})/(p,q)\mathbb{Z} \to 0\ .$$

Since the $\mathrm{PU}(p,q)$-orbits in $\mathrm{Hom}(\pi_1 X, \mathrm{PU}(p,q))$ under the conjugation action correspond to isomorphism classes of flat $\mathrm{PU}(p,q)$-bundles, the above construction defines a map

$$c : \mathcal{R}(\mathrm{PU}(p,q)) \longrightarrow (\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z})/(p,q). \tag{2.4}$$

The map is continuous and is thus constant on connected components of $\mathcal{R}(\mathrm{PU}(p,q))$.

Remark 2.1. This map can be seen from a different point of view, from which it seen that the target space is $\pi_1 \mathrm{PU}(p,q)$. We begin with the observation that the flat bundle P_ρ is described by locally constant transition functions. Thus the isomorphism class of this bundle is represented by a class in the (non-abelian) cohomology set $H^1(X, \mathrm{PU}(p,q))$, where, by abuse of notation, we denote the sheaf of locally constant maps into $\mathrm{PU}(p,q)$ on X by the same symbol $\mathrm{PU}(p,q)$. Let $\widetilde{\mathrm{PU}}(p,q)$ be the universal cover of $\mathrm{PU}(p,q)$. The short exact sequence of groups

$$\pi_1 \mathrm{PU}(p,q) \to \widetilde{\mathrm{PU}}(p,q) \to \mathrm{PU}(p,q)$$

induces a sequence of cohomology sets and, since $\pi_1 \mathrm{PU}(p,q)$ is Abelian, the coboundary map

$$\delta\colon H^1(X, \mathrm{PU}(p,q)) \to H^2(X, \pi_1 \mathrm{PU}(p,q))$$

can be defined. The obstruction to lifting the flat $\mathrm{PU}(p,q)$-bundle P_ρ to a flat $\widetilde{\mathrm{PU}}(p,q)$-bundle is exactly the image of the cohomology class of P_ρ under δ. We denote this class by $c(\rho) \in H^2(X, \pi_1 \mathrm{PU}(p,q)) \cong \pi_1 \mathrm{PU}(p,q)$. Next we recall the calculation of $\pi_1 \mathrm{PU}(p,q)$. The maximal compact subgroup of $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$ is $\mathrm{U}(p) \times \mathrm{U}(q)$ and the inclusion $\mathrm{U}(p) \times \mathrm{U}(q) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{U}(p,q)$ is a homotopy equivalence. The determinant gives an isomorphism of fundamental groups $\pi_1 \mathrm{U}(p) \xrightarrow{\cong} \pi_1 \mathrm{U}(1) \cong \mathbb{Z}$. Hence the map $\mathrm{U}(p,q) \to \mathrm{U}(1) \times \mathrm{U}(1)$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{U}(p,q) &\to \mathrm{U}(1) \times \mathrm{U}(1) \\ \begin{pmatrix} x & y \\ z & w \end{pmatrix} &\mapsto (\det(x), \det(w)) \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

gives an isomorphism $\pi_1 \mathrm{U}(p,q) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}$. Furthermore, the composition of the standard inclusion $\mathrm{U}(1) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{U}(p,q)$ and the map given in (2.5) is the map $\lambda \mapsto (\lambda^p, \lambda^q)$ from $\mathrm{U}(1) \to \mathrm{U}(1) \times \mathrm{U}(1)$. The induced map on fundamental groups is $n \mapsto (pn, qn)$. The short exact sequence

$$\mathrm{U}(1) \to \mathrm{U}(p,q) \to \mathrm{PU}(p,q) \tag{2.6}$$

is a fibration, so we see that $\pi_1 \mathrm{U}(p,q) \to \pi_1 \mathrm{PU}(p,q)$ is surjective. It follows that we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\pi_1 \mathrm{U}(1) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\cong"'] & \pi_1 \mathrm{U}(p,q) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\cong"'] & \pi_1 \mathrm{PU}(p,q) \arrow[d, "\cong"'] \\
\mathbb{Z} \arrow[r, "(p\cdot, q\cdot)"] & \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z} \arrow[r] & (\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z})/(p,q)\mathbb{Z}
\end{tikzcd}$$

and hence $c(\rho)$ defines a class $[a,b] \in (\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z})/(p,q)\mathbb{Z}$. This is the same class as that defined by the map (2.4) though, since we will not make use of this, we omit the proof.

2.2 Invariants on $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(\mathrm{U}(p,q))$ and relation to $\mathcal{R}(\mathrm{PU}(p,q))$

Putting together (2.6) and (2.3) we get the commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{U}(1) \arrow[r] & \mathrm{U}(p,q) \arrow[r] & \mathrm{PU}(p,q) \\
\mathbb{Z} \arrow[r] \arrow[u] & \Gamma \arrow[r] \arrow[u, "\tilde\rho"] & \pi_1 X \arrow[u, "\rho"]
\end{tikzcd} .$$

From this we get a surjection $\pi : \mathcal{R}_\Gamma(\mathrm{U}(p,q)) \to \mathcal{R}(\mathrm{PU}(p,q))$. We can understand the fibers of this map as follows. By the same argument as in [3][1], $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(\mathrm{U}(p,q))$ can be identified as the moduli space of $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-bundles on X with projectively flat structures. Taking the reduction to the maximal compact $\mathrm{U}(p)\times\mathrm{U}(q)$, we thus associate to each class $\tilde\rho \in \mathcal{R}_\Gamma(\mathrm{U}(p,q))$ a vector bundle of the form $V \oplus W$, where V and W are rank p and q respectively, and thus a pair of integers $(a,b) = (\deg(V), \deg(W))$. The map $\tilde c : \tilde\rho \mapsto (a,b)$ fits in a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(\mathrm{U}(p,q)) \arrow[r, "\pi"] \arrow[d, "\tilde c"] & \mathcal{R}(\mathrm{PU}(p,q)) \arrow[d, "c"] \\
\mathbb{Z}\oplus\mathbb{Z} \arrow[r] & (\mathbb{Z}\oplus\mathbb{Z})/(p,q)\mathbb{Z}
\end{tikzcd} .$$

We can now define the subspaces

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(a,b) :&= \tilde c^{-1}(a,b) \\
&= \{\tilde\rho \in \mathcal{R}_\Gamma(\mathrm{U}(p,q)) \mid \tilde c(\tilde\rho) = (a,b) \in \mathbb{Z}\oplus\mathbb{Z}\}, \\
\mathcal{R}[a,b] :&= c^{-1}[a,b] \\
&= \{\rho \in \mathcal{R}(\mathrm{PU}(p,q)) \mid c(\rho) = [a,b] \in \mathbb{Z}\oplus\mathbb{Z}/(p,q)\mathbb{Z}\} .
\end{aligned}$$

Clearly we have surjective maps

$$\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(a,b) \to \mathcal{R}[a,b]. \tag{2.7}$$

Moreover, the pre-image

$$\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{R}[a,b]) = \bigcup_{(a,b)} \mathcal{R}_\Gamma(a,b) \tag{2.8}$$

where the union is over all (a,b) in the class $[a,b] \in \mathbb{Z}\oplus\mathbb{Z}/(p,q)\mathbb{Z}$. As mentioned above, tensoring by line bundles with constant curvature connections of degree l gives an isomorphism

$$\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(a,b) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{R}_\Gamma(a+pl, b+ql) .$$

---

[1] While [3] gives the argument for $\mathrm{U}(n)$ and $\mathrm{PU}(n)$, there are no essential changes to be made in order to adapt for the case of $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$ and $\mathrm{PU}(p,q)$.

Notice that if the invariant $c(\rho)$ of a representation $\rho \in \mathcal{R}(\mathrm{PU}(p,q))$ can be represented by the pair $(a,-a)$, then the associated $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-bundle has degree zero and the projectively flat connection is actually flat. Thus ρ defines to a representation of $\pi_1 X$ in $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$. Under the correspondence between $\mathcal{R}(\mathrm{PU}(p,q))$ and $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(\mathrm{U}(p,q))$, ρ corresponds to a Γ representation in which the central element J acts trivially. Furthermore the subspaces

$$\mathcal{R}(a) = \{\rho \in \mathcal{R}(\mathrm{U}(p,q)) \ \mid \ c(\rho) = (a,-a) \ \text{ with } \ a \in \mathbb{Z}\}$$

can be identified with the subspaces $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(a,-a) \subset \mathcal{R}_\Gamma(\mathrm{U}(p,q))$. Finally, we observe that $\mathrm{Jac}(X)$, the moduli space of flat degree zero line bundles, acts by tensor product of bundles on $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(a,b)$. Since $\mathrm{Jac}(X)$ is isomorphic to the torus $\mathrm{U}(1)^{2g}$, we get the following relation between connected components.

Proposition 2.2. *The map* $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(a,b) \to \mathcal{R}[a,b]$ *given in* (2.7) *defines a* $\mathrm{U}(1)^{2g}$*-fibration which, if the total space and base are smooth manifolds, is a smooth principal bundle. Thus the subspace* $\mathcal{R}[a,b] \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\mathrm{PU}(p,q))$ *is connected if* $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(a,b)$ *is connected.* □

We will study $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(a,b)$ by choosing a complex structure on X and identifying this space with a certain moduli space of Higgs bundles. This is carried out in the next section. In the rest of the paper, the subspaces of irreducible representations are denoted by $\mathcal{R}^*$.

3 Higgs bundles and flat connections

3.1 GL(n)-Higgs bundles

Give X the structure of a Riemann surface. We recall (from [12, 10, 23, 31, 33, 34]) the following basic facts about $\mathrm{GL}(n)$-Higgs bundles.

Definition 3.1.

1. *A* $\mathrm{GL}(n)$*-Higgs bundle on* X *is a pair* (E,Φ)*, where* E *is a rank* n *holomorphic vector bundle over* X *and* $\Phi \in H^0(\mathrm{End}(E) \otimes K)$ *is a holomorphic endomorphism of* E *twisted by the canonical bundle* K *of* X*.*

2. *The* $\mathrm{GL}(n)$*-Higgs bundle* (E,Φ) *is* stable *if the slope stability condition*

$$\mu(E') < \mu(E) \tag{3.1}$$

holds for all proper Φ*-invariant subbundles* E' *of* E*. Here the slope is defined by* $\mu(E) = \deg(E)/\operatorname{rk}(E)$ *and* Φ*-invariance means that* $\Phi(E') \subset E' \otimes K$*.*

3. *Semistability is defined by replacing the above strict inequality with a weak inequality. A Higgs bundle is called polystable if is the direct sum of stable Higgs bundles with the same slope.*

4. *Given a hermitian metric H on E, let A denote the unique connection compatible with the holomorphic structure and unitary with respect to H. Hitchin's equations on (E, Φ) are*

$$\begin{aligned} F_A + [\Phi, \Phi^*] &= -\sqrt{-1}\mu Id_E \omega, \\ \bar{\partial}_A \Phi &= 0, \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

where ω is the Kähler form on X, Id_E is the identity on E, $\mu = \mu(E)$ and $\bar{\partial}_A$ is the antiholomorphic part of the covariant derivative d_A .

Proposition 3.2. *[12, 23, 31, 33, 34]*

1. *Let (E, Φ) be a $\mathrm{GL}(n)$-Higgs bundle. Then (E, Φ) is polystable if and only if it admits a hermitian metric such that Hitchin's equation (3.2) is satisfied*

2. *There is a moduli space of rank n degree d polystable Higgs bundles which is a quasi-projective variety of complex dimension $2(d+n^2(g-1))$.*

3. *If we define a Higgs connection (as in [33]) by*

$$D = d_A + \theta \tag{3.3}$$

where $\theta = \Phi + \Phi^*$, then Hitchin's equations are equivalent to the conditions

$$\begin{aligned} F_D &= -\sqrt{-1}\mu Id_E \omega, \\ d_A \theta &= 0, \\ d_A^* \theta &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

4. *In particular, since X is a Riemann surface, if A satisfies (3.2) then D is a projectively flat connection. If $\deg(E) = 0$ then D is actually flat. It follows that in this case the pair (E, D) defines a representation of $\pi_1 X$ in $\mathrm{GL}(n)$. If $\deg(E) \neq 0$, then the pair (E, D) defines a representation of $\pi_1 X$ in $\mathrm{PGL}(n)$, or equivalently, a representation of Γ in $\mathrm{GL}(n)$. By the theorem of Corlette ([10]), every semisimple representation of Γ (and therefore all semisimple representation of $\pi_1 X$) arise in this way.*

5. *There is thus a bijective correspondence between the moduli space of polystable Higgs bundles of rank n and the moduli space of (conjugacy classes of) semisimple representations of Γ in $\mathrm{GL}(n)$. If the degree of the Higgs bundle is zero, then the first moduli space corresponds actually to the representation variety for representations of $\pi_1 X$ in $\mathrm{GL}(n)$.*

3.2 $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundles

If we fix integers p, q such that $n = p + q$, then we can isolate a special class of $\mathrm{GL}(n)$-Higgs bundles by the requirements that

$$\begin{aligned} E &= V \oplus W \\ \Phi &= \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & \beta \\ \gamma & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right) \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

where V and W are holomorphic vector bundles on X with $\mathrm{rk}(V) = p$, $\mathrm{rk}(W) = q$, $\deg(V) = a$, $\deg(W) = b$, $\beta \in H^0(\mathrm{Hom}(W,V) \otimes K)$, and $\gamma \in H^0(\mathrm{Hom}(V,W) \otimes K)$. We can describe such Higgs bundles more intrinsically as follows. Let $P_{\mathrm{GL}(p)}$ and $P_{\mathrm{GL}(q)}$ be the principal frame bundles for V and W respectively. Let $P = P_{\mathrm{GL}(p)} \times P_{\mathrm{GL}(q)}$ be the fiber product, and let $\mathrm{Ad}\, P = P \times_{\mathrm{Ad}} \mathfrak{gl}(n)$ be the adjoint bundle, where $\mathrm{GL}(p) \times \mathrm{GL}(q) \subset \mathrm{GL}(n)$ acts by the Ad-action on the the Lie algebra of $\mathrm{GL}(n)$. Let $(\mathfrak{gl}(p) \oplus \mathfrak{gl}(q))^\perp \subset \mathfrak{gl}(n)$ be the orthogonal complement with respect to the usual inner product. This defines a subbundle

$$P_{p,q} := P \times_{\mathrm{Ad}} (\mathfrak{gl}(p) \oplus \mathfrak{gl}(q))^\perp \subset \mathrm{Ad}\, P\ . \tag{3.6}$$

We can then make the following definition.

Definition 3.3. *A $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundle*[2] *on X is a pair (P, Φ) where P is a holomorphic principal $\mathrm{GL}(p) \times \mathrm{GL}(q)$ bundle, and Φ is a holomorphic section of the vector bundle $P_{p,q} \otimes K$ (where $P_{p,q}$ is the bundle defined in (3.6).*

Remark 3.4. We can always write $P = P_{\mathrm{GL}(p)} \times P_{\mathrm{GL}(q)}$. If we let V and W be the standard vector bundles associated to $P_{\mathrm{GL}(p)}$ and $P_{\mathrm{GL}(q)}$ respectively, then any $\Phi \in H^0(P_{p,q} \otimes K)$ can be written as in (3.5). We will usually adopt the vector bundle description of $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundles.

Remark 3.5. Definition 3.3 is compatible with the definitions in [24] and in [18]. There they define a G-Higgs bundle for any real form of a complex reductive Lie group. The bundle in their definition is a principal $H^{\mathbb{C}}$-bundle, where $H \subset G$ is a maximal compact subgroup and $H^{\mathbb{C}}$ is its complexification. Thus in the case that $G = \mathrm{U}(p,q)$, we get that $H^{\mathbb{C}} = \mathrm{GL}(p) \times \mathrm{GL}(q)$. The Higgs field is precisely a section of the bundles which appears in Definition 3.3. From a different perspective, Definition 3.3 defines an example of a principal pair in the sense of [4] and [27]. Strictly speaking, since the canonical bundle K plays the role of a fixed 'twisting bundle', what we get is a principal pair in the sense of [8]. The defining data for the pair are then (i) the principal $\mathrm{GL}(p) \times \mathrm{GL}(q) \times \mathrm{GL}(1)$-bundle $P_{\mathrm{GL}(p)} \times P_{\mathrm{GL}(q)} \times P_K$, where P_K is the frame bundle for K and (ii) the associated vector bundle $P_{p,q} \otimes K$.

---

[2] The reason for the name is explained by the following remarks and by Lemma 3.6

Lemma 3.6. *Let $(V \oplus W, \Phi)$ be a $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundle with a Hermitian metric $H = H_V \oplus H_W$, i.e. such that $V \oplus W$ is a unitary decomposition. Let A be a unitary connection with respect to H, and let $D = d_A + \theta$ be the corresponding Higgs connection, where $\theta = \Phi + \Phi^*$. Then D is a $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-connection, i.e. in any unitary local frame the connection 1-form takes its values in the Lie algebra of $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$.*

Proof. Fix a local unitary frame (with respect to $H = H_V \oplus H_W$). Then $D = d + A + \theta$, where A takes its values in $\mathfrak{u}(p) \oplus \mathfrak{u}(q) \subset \mathfrak{u}(p,q) \subset \mathfrak{u}(n)$, while θ takes its values in $(\mathfrak{u}(p) \oplus \mathfrak{u}(q))^{\perp} \cap \mathfrak{u}(p,q)$. ☐

Definition 3.7. *Let (E, Φ) be a $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundle with $E = V \oplus W$ and $\Phi = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & \beta \\ \gamma & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$. We say (E, Φ) is a stable $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundle if the slope stability condition (3.1), i.e. $\mu(E') < \mu(E)$, is satisfied for all Φ-invariant subbundles of the form $E' = V' \oplus W'$, i.e. for all subbundles $V' \subset V$ and $W' \subset W$ such that*

$$\beta : W' \longrightarrow V' \otimes K \tag{3.7}$$

$$\gamma : V' \longrightarrow W' \otimes K \ . \tag{3.8}$$

Semistability for $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundles is defined by replacing the above strict inequality with a weak inequality, and polystability means a direct sum of stable $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundles all with the same slope. In particular a polystable $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundle is the direct sum of (lower rank) $\mathrm{U}(p',q')$-Higgs bundles. We shall say that a polystable $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundle which is not stable is reducible. *Two $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundles $(V \oplus W, \Phi)$ and $(V' \oplus W', \Phi')$ are isomorphic if there are isomorphisms $g_V : V \to V'$ and $g_W : W \to W'$ which intertwine Φ and Φ', i.e. such that $(g_V \oplus g_W) \otimes I_K \circ \Phi = \Phi' \circ (g_V \oplus g_W)$ where I_K is the identity on K.*

Remark 3.8. The stability condition for a $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundle is *a priori* weaker than the stability condition given in Definition 3.1 for $\mathrm{GL}(n)$-Higgs bundles. Namely, the slope condition has to be satisfied only for all proper non-zero Φ-invariant subbundles which respect the decomposition $E = V \oplus W$, that is, subbundles of the form $E' = V' \oplus W'$ with $V' \subseteq V$ and $W' \subseteq W$. However, it is shown in [19, Section 2.3] that the weaker condition is in fact equivalent to the ordinary stability of (E, Φ).

Proposition 3.9. *Let (E, Φ) be a $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundle with $E = V \oplus W$ and $\Phi = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & \beta \\ \gamma & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$. Then (E, Φ) is $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-polystable if and only if it admits a compatible hermitian metric $H = H_V \oplus H_W$ such that Hitchin's equation (3.2) is satisfied*

Proof. Though not explicitly proved there, this is a special case of the correspondence invoked in [24] for G-Higgs bundles where G is a real form of a reductive Lie group. By Remark 3.5 it can also be seen as a special case of the Hitchin–Kobayashi correspondence for principal pairs (cf. [4] and [27] and [8]). We note finally that in one direction the result follows immediately from Remark 3.8 : if $(V \oplus W, \Phi)$ supports a compatible metric such that (3.2) is satisfied, then it is polystable as a $\mathrm{GL}(n)$-Higgs bundle, and hence it is $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-polystable. □

Remark 3.10. This correspondence allows us, via the next theorem, to use $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundles to study representations of the surface groups $\pi_1 X$ and Γ into $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$ and $\mathrm{PU}(p,q)$

Definition 3.11. *Fix integers a and b. Let $\mathcal{M}(a,b)$ denote the moduli space of isomorphism classes of polystable $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundles with* $\deg(V) = a$ *and* $\deg W = b$.

Proposition 3.12. *The moduli space $\mathcal{M}(a,b)$ can be identified with the moduli space of $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundles which admit solutions to Hitchin's equations. It is a quasi-projective variety which is smooth away from the points representing reducible $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundles. There is an homeomorphism between $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(a,b)$ and $\mathcal{M}(a,b)$. This restricts to give a homeomorphism between the subspace $\mathcal{R}^*_\Gamma(a,b)$ of irreducible elements in $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(a,b)$ and the subspace $\mathcal{M}^s(a,b)$ of stable Higgs bundles in $\mathcal{M}(a,b)$.*

Proof. The first statement is a direct consequence of Proposition 3.9. The construction of $\mathcal{M}(a,b)$ is essentially the same as in section §9 of [33]. There the moduli space of G-Higgs bundles is constructed for any reductive group

G. We take $G = \mathrm{GL}(p) \times \mathrm{GL}(q)$. The difference between a $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundle and a $\mathrm{GL}(p) \times \mathrm{GL}(q)$-Higgs bundle is entirely in the nature of the Higgs fields. Taking the standard embedding of $\mathrm{GL}(p) \times \mathrm{GL}(q)$ in $\mathrm{GL}(p+q)$ we see that in a $\mathrm{GL}(p) \times \mathrm{GL}(q)$-Higgs bundle the Higgs field Φ takes its values in the subspace $(\mathfrak{gl}(p) \oplus \mathfrak{gl}(q)) \subset \mathfrak{gl}(p+q)$, while in a $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundle the Higgs field Φ takes its values in the complementary subspace $(\mathfrak{gl}(p) \oplus \mathfrak{gl}(q))^{\perp}$. Since both subspaces are invariant under the adjoint action of $\mathrm{GL}(p) \times \mathrm{GL}(q)$, the same method of construction works for the moduli spaces of both types of Higgs bundle.

Suppose that $(E = V \oplus W, \Phi)$ represents a point in $\mathcal{M}(a,b)$, i.e. suppose that it is a $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-polystable Higgs bundle, and suppose that with metric $H = H_V \oplus H_W$ Hitchin's equation (3.2) is satisfied. Rewriting the equations in terms of the Higgs connection $D = d_A + \theta$, where A is the metric connection determined by H and $\theta = \Phi + \Phi^*$, we see that D is projectively flat. By Lemma 3.6 it is a projectively flat $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-connection, and thus defines a point in $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(a,b)$. Conversely by Corlette's theorem [10], every representation in $\mathrm{Hom}^+(\pi_1 X, \mathrm{PU}(p,q))$, or equivalently every representation in $\mathrm{Hom}^+(\Gamma, \mathrm{U}(p,q))$, arises in this way. $\square$

Remark 3.13. If $\mathrm{GCD}(p+q, a+b) = 1$ then for purely numerical reasons there are no strictly semistable $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundles in $\mathcal{M}(a,b)$. In this case $\mathcal{M}^s(a,b) = \mathcal{M}(a,b)$.

Proposition 3.14. *With $n = p+q$ and $d = a+b$, let $\mathcal{M}(d)$ denote the moduli space of polystable* $\mathrm{GL}(n)$*-Higgs bundles of degree d. If $p \neq q$ or $a \neq b$ then $\mathcal{M}(a,b)$ embeds as a closed subvariety in $\mathcal{M}(d)$. If $p = q$ and $a = b$, then there is a finite morphism from $\mathcal{M}(a,a)$ to $\mathcal{M}(d)$.*

Proof. Let $[V \oplus W, \Phi]_{p,q}$ denote the point in $\mathcal{M}(a,b)$ represented by the $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundle $(V \oplus W, \Phi)$. Then $(E = V \oplus W, \Phi)$ is a polystable $\mathrm{GL}(n)$-Higgs bundle and the map $\mathcal{M}(a,b) \to \mathcal{M}(d)$ is defined by

$$[V \oplus W, \Phi]_{p,q} \mapsto [E, \Phi]_n \ ,$$

where $[,]_n$ denotes the isomorphism class in $\mathcal{M}(d)$. The only question is whether this map is injective. Suppose that $(E = V \oplus W, \Phi)$ and $(E' = V' \oplus W', \Phi')$ are isomorphic as $\mathrm{GL}(n)$-Higgs bundles. Let the isomorphism be given by complex gauge transformation $g : E \to E'$. Since we can regard the smooth splitting of E as fixed, we see that unless $V \cong W'$ and $W \cong V'$, the gauge transformation must already be of the form $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} g_V & 0 \\ 0 & g_W \end{smallmatrix}\right)$, i.e. $[V \oplus W, \Phi]_{p,q} = [V' \oplus W', \Phi']_{p,q}$. But in order to have $V \cong W'$ and $W \cong V'$ we require

$p = q$ and $a = b$. In that case, if V and W are non-isomorphic, then $[V \oplus W, \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & \beta \\ \gamma & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)]_n = [W \oplus V, \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & \gamma \\ \beta & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)]_n$ but the Higgs bundles are not isomorphic as $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundles. □

3.3 Deformation theory of Higgs bundles

A main tool in the study of the topology of moduli spaces of Higgs bundles is given by the Morse theoretic techniques introduced by Hitchin [24]. In order to use these methods, we first need to recall the deformation theory of Higgs bundles. We refer to the paper by Biswas and Ramanan [5] for details. Let (E,Φ) be a stable $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundle in $\mathcal{M}^s(a,b)$. Some times it will be convenient to use the following notation:

$$\begin{aligned} U &= \mathrm{End}(E) \\ U^+ &= \mathrm{End}(V) \oplus \mathrm{End}(W), \\ U^- &= \mathrm{Hom}(W,V) \oplus \mathrm{Hom}(V,W). \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

Clearly, $U = U^+ \oplus U^-$. Note that $\Phi \in H^0(U^- \otimes K)$ and that $\mathrm{ad}(\Phi)$ interchanges U^+ and U^-. As it is shown in [5], the Zariski tangent space to $\mathcal{M}^s(a,b)$ at the point defined by (E,Φ) can be identified with the first hypercohomology of the complex of sheaves

$$C^\bullet : U^+ \xrightarrow{\mathrm{ad}(\Phi)} U^- \otimes K. \tag{3.10}$$

One has the long exact sequence

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow \mathbb{H}^0(C^\bullet) & \longrightarrow & H^0(U^+) & \longrightarrow & H^0(U^- \otimes K) & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{H}^1(C^\bullet) & \\ & & \longrightarrow & H^1(U^+) & \longrightarrow & H^1(U^- \otimes K) & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{H}^2(C^\bullet) & \longrightarrow \ 0, \end{array} \tag{3.11}$$

from which one obtains the following.

Proposition 3.15. *The moduli space of stable* $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$*-Higgs bundles is a smooth complex variety of dimension* $1 + (p+q)^2(g-1)$.

Proof. Let (E,Φ) be a stable $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundle. Then (E,Φ) is simple, that is, its only automorphisms are the non-zero scalars. Thus, if (E,Φ) is stable,

$$\ker\bigl(\mathrm{ad}(\Phi) \colon H^0(U) \to H^0(U \otimes K)\bigr) = \mathbb{C}.$$

Since $U = U^+ \oplus U^-$ and $\mathrm{ad}(\Phi)$ interchanges these two summands it follows that

$$\ker\bigl(\mathrm{ad}(\Phi)\colon H^0(U^+) \to H^0(U^- \otimes K)\bigr) = \mathbb{C} \tag{3.12}$$

$$\ker\bigl(\mathrm{ad}(\Phi)\colon H^0(U^-) \to H^0(U^+ \otimes K)\bigr) = 0 \tag{3.13}$$

Hence, if (E, Φ) is stable, (3.12) shows that $\mathbb{H}^0(C^\bullet) = \mathbb{C}$. To show that the moduli space is smooth at a neighbourhood of (E, Φ) we need to show that $\mathbb{H}^2(C^\bullet) = 0$. But we have natural ad-invariant isomorphisms $U^+ \cong (U^+)^*$ and $U^- \cong (U^-)^*$. Thus

$$\mathrm{ad}(\Phi)\colon H^1(U^+) \to H^1(U^- \otimes K)$$

is Serre dual to $\mathrm{ad}(\Phi)\colon H^0(U^-) \to H^0(U^+ \otimes K)$. Thus (3.13) shows that $\mathbb{H}^2(C^\bullet) = 0$. The dimension of the moduli space is hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\dim \mathbb{H}^1(C^\bullet) &= 1 - \chi(U^+) + \chi(U^- \otimes K) \\
&= 1 + (p^2 + q^2)(g-1) + 2pq(g-1) \\
&= 1 + (p+q)^2(g-1).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 3.16. Notice that the dimension of the moduli space of stable $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundles is half the dimension of the moduli space of stable $\mathrm{GL}(p+q,\mathbb{C})$-Higgs bundles.

Remark 3.17. As pointed out previously, if $\mathrm{GCD}(p+q, a+b) = 1$, then there are no strictly semistable elements in $\mathcal{M}(a,b)$ and hence $\mathcal{M}(a,b)$ is smooth.

3.4 Bounds on the topological invariants

In this section we shall show how the Higgs bundle point of view provides an easy proof of a result of Domic and Toledo [11] which allows us to bound the topological invariants $\deg(V)$ and $\deg(W)$ for which $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundles may exist. The lemma is a slight variation on the results of [19, Section 3] (cf. also Lemma 3.6 of Markman and Xia [26]).

Lemma 3.18. *Let (E, Φ) be a semistable $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundle. Then*

$$p(\mu(V) - \mu(E)) \leqslant \mathrm{rk}(\gamma)(g-1), \tag{3.14}$$

$$q(\mu(W) - \mu(E)) \leqslant \mathrm{rk}(\beta)(g-1). \tag{3.15}$$

If equality occurs in (3.14) then either (E, Φ) is strictly semistable or $p = q$ and γ is an isomorphism. If equality occurs in (3.15) then either (E, Φ) is strictly semistable or $p = q$ and β is an isomorphism.

Proof. If $\gamma = 0$ then V is Φ-invariant and so, by stability, $\mu(V) \leqslant \mu(E)$ where equality can only occur if (E, Φ) is strictly semistable. This proves (3.14) in the case $\gamma = 0$ and we may, therefore, assume that $\gamma \neq 0$. Let $N \subseteq V$ be the vector bundle associated to $\ker(\gamma)$ and let $I \subseteq W$ be the vector bundle associated to $\operatorname{im}(\gamma) \otimes K^{-1}$. Then

$$\operatorname{rk}(N) + \operatorname{rk}(I) = p \tag{3.16}$$

and, since γ induces a non-zero section of $\det((V/N)^* \otimes I \otimes K)$,

$$\deg(N) + \deg(I) + \operatorname{rk}(I)(2g-2) \geqslant \deg(V). \tag{3.17}$$

The bundles N and $V \oplus I$ are Φ-invariant subbundles of E and hence we obtain by semistability that $\mu(N) \leqslant \mu(E)$ and $\mu(V \oplus I) \leqslant \mu(E)$ or, equivalently, that

$$\deg(N) \leqslant \mu(E)\operatorname{rk}(N), \tag{3.18}$$

$$\deg(I) \leqslant \mu(E)(p + \operatorname{rk}(I)) - \deg(V). \tag{3.19}$$

Adding (3.18) and (3.19) and using (3.16) we obtain

$$\deg(N) + \deg(I) \leqslant 2\mu(E)p - \deg(V). \tag{3.20}$$

Finally, combining (3.17) and (3.20) we get

$$\deg(V) - \operatorname{rk}(I)(2g-2) \leqslant 2\mu(E)p - \deg(V),$$

which is equivalent to (3.14) since $\operatorname{rk}(\gamma) = \operatorname{rk}(I)$. Note that equality can only occur if we have equality in (3.18) and (3.19) and thus either (E, Φ) is strictly semistable or neither of the subbundles N and $V \oplus I$ is proper and non-zero. In the latter case, clearly $N = 0$ and $I = W$ and therefore $p = q$; furthermore we must also have equality in (3.17) implying that γ is an isomorphism. An analogous argument applied to β proves (3.15). ☐

Remark 3.19. The proof also shows that if we have equality in, say, (3.14) then $\gamma \colon V/N \to I \otimes K$ is an isomorphism. In particular, if $p < q$ and $\mu(V) - \mu(E) = g - 1$ then $\gamma \colon V \xrightarrow{\cong} I \otimes K$.

We can reformulate Lemma 3.18 to obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 3.20. *Let (E, Φ) be a semistable $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundle. Then*

$$q(\mu(E) - \mu(W)) \leqslant \operatorname{rk}(\gamma)(g-1), \tag{3.21}$$

$$p(\mu(E) - \mu(V)) \leqslant \operatorname{rk}(\beta)(g-1). \tag{3.22}$$

Proof. To see that (3.21) is equivalent to (3.14) one simply notes that $\mu(W)-\mu(E)=\frac{p}{q}\big(\mu(E)-\mu(V)\big)$. Similarly (3.22) is equivalent to (3.15). $\square$

An important corollary of the lemma above is the following Milnor–Wood type inequality for $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundles (due to Domic and Toledo [11], improving on a bound obtained by Dupont [13] in the case $G=\mathrm{SU}(p,q)$). This result gives bounds on the possible values of the topological invariants $\deg(V)$ and $\deg(W)$.

Corollary 3.21. *Let (E,Φ) be a semistable $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundle. Then*

$$\frac{pq}{p+q}|\mu(V)-\mu(W)|\leqslant \min\{p,q\}(g-1). \tag{3.23}$$

Proof. Since $\mu(E)=\frac{p}{p+q}\mu(V)+\frac{q}{p+q}\mu(W)$ we have $\mu(V)-\mu(E)=\frac{q}{p+q}(\mu(V)-\mu(W)$ and therefore (3.14) gives

$$\frac{pq}{p+q}(\mu(V)-\mu(W))\leqslant \mathrm{rk}(\gamma)(g-1).$$

A similar argument using (3.15) shows that

$$\frac{pq}{p+q}(\mu(W)-\mu(V))\leqslant \mathrm{rk}(\beta)(g-1).$$

But, obviously, $\mathrm{rk}(\beta)$ and $\mathrm{rk}(\gamma)$ are both less than or equal to $\min\{p,q\}$ and the result follows. $\square$

Definition 3.22. *Let $a=\deg(V)$ and $b=\deg(W)$. The number*

$$\tau=\tau(a,b)=2\frac{qa-pb}{p+q} \tag{3.24}$$

is known as the **Toledo invariant** *of the representation corresponding to (E,Φ).*

Remark 3.23. Since

$$\tau=2\frac{pq}{p+q}(\mu(V)-\mu(W)),$$

the inequality (3.23) can thus be written

$$|\tau|\leqslant \min\{p,q\}(2g-2)\ .$$

We denote $\tau_M=\min\{p,q\}(2g-2)$.

3.5 Moduli space for $p = q$ and $|\tau| = \tau_M$

Suppose $p = q$. Then $\tau = \tau(p, p, a, b) = a - b$. In this section we give an alternative (more explicit) description of the moduli space $\mathcal{M}(a, b)$ in the case in which the Toledo invariant is maximal, i.e. $|\tau| = |a - b| = \tau_M = p(2g - 2)$.

Before doing this, we need to review briefly the notion of L-twisted Higgs pairs. Let L be a line bundle. An L-twisted Higgs pair (V, θ) consists of a holomorphic vector bundle V and an L-twisted homomorphism $\theta : V \longrightarrow V \otimes L$. The notions of stability, semistability and polystability are defined as for Higgs bundles. The moduli space of semistable L-twisted Higgs pairs has been constructed by Nitsure using GIT [29]. Let $\mathcal{M}_L(n, d)$ be the moduli space of polystable L-twisted Higgs pairs of rank n and degree d.

Proposition 3.24. *Let $p = q$ and $|a - b| = p(2g - 2)$. Then*

$$\mathcal{M}(a, b) \cong \mathcal{M}_{K^2}(p, a) \cong \mathcal{M}_{K^2}(p, b).$$

Proof. Let $(E = V \oplus W, \Phi) \in \mathcal{M}(a, b)$. Suppose for definiteness that $b - a = p(2g - 2)$. From (3.15) it follows that $\gamma : V \longrightarrow W \otimes K$ is an isomorphism. We can then compose $\beta : W \longrightarrow V \otimes K$ with $\gamma \otimes \mathrm{Id}_K : V \otimes K \longrightarrow W \otimes K^2$ to obtain a K^2-twisted Higgs pair $\theta_W : W \longrightarrow W \otimes K^2$. Similarly, twisting $\beta : W \longrightarrow V \otimes K$ with K and composing with γ, we obtain a K^2-twisted Higgs pair $\theta_V : V \longrightarrow V \otimes K^2$. Conversely, given an isomorphism $\gamma : V \longrightarrow W \otimes K$, we can recover β from θ_V as well as from θ_W. It is clear that the (poly)stability of (E, Φ) is equivalent to the (poly)stability of (V, θ_V) and to the (poly)stability of (W, θ_W), proving the claim. ☐

Remark 3.25. The moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{K^2}(p, a)$ contains an open (irreducible) subset consisting of a rank N vector bundle over $M^s(p, a)$. This is because the stability of V implies the stability of any K^2-twisted Higgs pair (V, θ_V), and $H^1(\mathrm{End}\, V \otimes K^2) = 0$. The rank N is determined by the Riemann–Roch Theorem.

3.6 Rigidity for extreme values of the Toledo invariant

From the bounds in Section 3.4 it follows that if $p < q$ (a similar result holds for $p > q$) and (a, b) such that $|\tau| = \tau_M$ there are no stable $\mathrm{U}(p, q)$-Higgs bundles and every element in $\mathcal{M}(a, b)$ is in fact reducible. In particular the moduli space has smaller dimension than expected exhibiting a certain kind of rigidity. This phenomenon (for large Toledo invariant) has been studied from the point of view of representations of the fundamental group by D.

Toledo [36] when $p = 1$ and L. Hernández [22] when $p = 2$. We deal here with the general case which, as far as we know, has not appeared previously in the literature. To state our result, we use the more precise notation $\mathcal{M}(p, q, a, b)$ for the moduli space of $\mathrm{U}(p, q)$-Higgs bundles such that $\deg(V) = a$, and $\deg(W) = b$, and write the Toledo invariant as

$$\tau = \tau(p, q, a, b) = 2\frac{qa - pb}{p + q}. \tag{3.25}$$

Proposition 3.26. *Let (p, q, a, b) with $p < q$ and $|\tau(p, q, a, b)| = p(2g - 2)$. Then every element in $\mathcal{M}(p, q, a, b)$ is strictly semistable and decompose as the direct sum of a polystable $\mathrm{U}(p, p)$-Higgs bundle with maximal Toledo invariant and a polystable vector bundle of rank $(q - p)$. To be precise, let $\tau = p(2g - 2)$, then*

$$\mathcal{M}(p, q, a, b) \cong \mathcal{M}(p, p, a, a - p(2g - 2)) \times M(q - p, b - a + p(2g - 2)). \tag{3.26}$$

In particular, the dimension at a smooth point in $\mathcal{M}(p, q, a, b)$ is $2 + (p^2 + 5q^2 - 2pq)(g - 1)$, and it is hence strictly smaller than the expected dimension. (A similar result holds if $p > q$, as well as if $\tau = -p(2g - 2)$).

Proof. Suppose that $\tau(p, q, a, b) = p(2g - 2)$. Let $(E, \Phi) \in \mathcal{M}(p, q, a, b)$. Then $\mu(V) - \mu(E) = g - 1$ and $\mu(E) - \mu(W) = \frac{p}{q}(g - 1)$. Since $\mathrm{rk}(\beta)$ and $\mathrm{rk}(\gamma)$ are at most p, it follows from (3.14) and (3.22) that $\mathrm{rk}(\beta) = \mathrm{rk}(\gamma) = p$. Let $W_\gamma = \mathrm{im}(\gamma) \otimes K^{-1}$ and let $W_\beta = \ker(\beta)$. One has that $V \oplus W_\gamma$ is a Φ-invariant subbundle of $V \oplus W$, and $\mu(V \oplus W_\gamma) = \mu(E)$. We see that (E, Φ) is strictly semistable (as we already knew from Lemma 3.18). Since it is polystable it must split as

$$(V \oplus W_\gamma, \Phi) \oplus (0 \oplus W/W_\gamma, 0).$$

In fact, using

$$0 \longrightarrow \ker(\Phi) \longrightarrow V \oplus W \longrightarrow (V \oplus W) \otimes K \longrightarrow 0.$$

we see that $\ker \Phi = (0 \oplus W_\beta, 0)$ and $W/W_\gamma = W_\beta$. It is clear that $(V \oplus W_\gamma, \Phi) \in \mathcal{M}(p, p, a, a - p(2g - 2))$ and $W_\beta \in M(q - p, b - a + p(2g - 2))$. Moreover, $(V \oplus W_\gamma, \Phi)$ has maximal Toledo invariant, that is, $\tau(p, p, a, a - p(2g - 2)) = 2p(g - 1)$. To complete the proof we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} &\dim \mathcal{M}^s(p, p, a, a - p(2g - 2)) + \dim M^s(q - p, b - a + p(2g - 2)) \\ &= 1 + (2p)^2(g - 1) + 1 + (q - p)^2(g - 1) = 2 + (p^2 + 5q^2 - 2pq)(g - 1), \end{aligned}$$

which, since $q > 1$, is smaller than $1 + (p + q)^2(g - 1)$, the dimension of $\mathcal{M}(p, q, a, b)$. ☐

Corollary 3.27. *Let* (p, q, a, b) *with* $p < q$ *and* $\tau(p, q, a, b) = p(2g-2)$*. Then*

$$\mathcal{M}(p, q, a, b) \cong \mathcal{M}_{K^2}(p, a - p(2g-2)) \times M(q-p, b-a+p(2g-2)).$$

Proof. It follows from Propositions 3.26 and 3.24. $\square$

4 Morse theory

4.1 The Morse function

An extremely efficient tool for studying topological properties of Higgs bundle moduli is considering the $\mathbb{C}^*$-action on the moduli space given by multiplying the Higgs field Φ by a non-zero scalar. In order to explain this, it is convenient to consider the moduli space from the gauge theory point of view. The $\mathrm{U}(1)$-action $\Phi \mapsto e^{i\theta}\Phi$ on $\mathcal{M}(a, b)$ preserves solutions to Hitchin's equations (3.2) (but the full $\mathbb{C}^*$-action does not preserve solutions to the first equation). Restricted to the smooth locus of $\mathcal{M}(a, b)$ this turns out to be a Hamiltonian circle action with moment map (up to multiplication by a constant)

$$f(A, \Phi) = \int_X |\Phi|^2,$$

the L^2-norm squared of the Higgs field. Thus, if the moduli space is smooth, f is a perfect Bott-Morse function (by a theorem of Frankel [14]; the essential point is that the Morse indices are even) and the critical points of f are exactly the fixed points of the circle action. In particular, if $\mathcal{M}(a, b)$ is smooth, then its number of connected components is the same as the number of connected components of the subspace of local minima of f. However, even if $\mathcal{M}(a, b)$ is not smooth, f can be used to obtain information about the connected components of $\mathcal{M}(a, b)$ in the following way. It was shown by Hitchin [23], using Uhlenbeck's weak compactness theorem, that f is proper. We have the following general result.

Proposition 4.1. *Let* Z *be a Hausforff space and let* $f\colon Z \to \mathbb{R}$ *be proper and bounded below. Then* f *attains a minimum on each connected component of* Z *and, furthermore, if the subspace of local minima of* f *is connected then so is* Z*.* $\square$

In particular this applies to our situation.

Proposition 4.2. *Let* $f\colon \mathcal{M}(a, b) \to \mathbb{R}$ *be defined as above. Then* f *has a minimum on each connected component of* $\mathcal{M}(a, b)$*. Moreover, if the subspace of local minima of* f *is connected then so is* $\mathcal{M}(a, b)$*.* $\square$

4.2 Critical points of the Morse function

Next we recall Hitchin's method [23, 24] for determining the local minima of f. A point (E, Φ) is a fixed point of the circle action if and only if it is a system of Hodge bundles, that is,

$$E = F_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus F_m \tag{4.1}$$

for holomorphic vector bundles F_i such that the restriction

$$\Phi_i := \Phi_{|F_i} \in H^0(\mathrm{Hom}(F_i, F_{i+1}) \otimes K).$$

To see why this is true, note that, if (A, Φ) represents a fixed point then there must be a 1-parameter family of gauge transformations $g(\theta)$ taking (A, Φ) to $(A, e^{i\theta}\Phi)$ and this gives an infinitesimal $\mathrm{U}(p) \times \mathrm{U}(q)$-gauge transformation $\psi = \dot{g}$ which is covariantly constant (i.e. $d_A\psi = 0$) and such that $[\psi, \Phi] = i\Phi$. It follows that we can decompose E in holomorphic subbundles F_λ on which ψ acts as $i\lambda$ and furthermore that Φ maps F_λ to $F_{\lambda+1} \otimes K$. If (E, Φ) is stable each of these components of Φ is non-zero since, otherwise, (E, Φ) would be reducible. We can therefore write $E = F_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus F_m$ where the weight of ψ on F_{k+1} is one plus the weight of ψ on F_k. In general (for reducible Higgs bundles) (E, Φ) is the direct sum of such chains. Furthermore, note that ψ preserves V and W and, therefore, the F_k are direct sums of bundles contained in V and W. The decomposition $E = F_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus F_m$ gives a corresponding decomposition of the bundle $U = \mathrm{End}(E)$ into eigenbundles for the adjoint action of ψ:

$$U = \bigoplus_{k=-m+1}^{m-1} U_k,$$

where $U_k = \bigoplus_{i-j=k} \mathrm{Hom}(F_j, F_i)$. We now show how to find the local minima of f which are represented by stable Higgs bundles. In fact, one can do much better: it is possible to calculate the Morse index at the critical point. It follows from Hitchin's calculations in [24, §8] (see also [18, Section 2.3.2]) that the subspace of the tangent space at (E, Φ) on which the Hessian of f has eigenvalue $-k$ is $\mathbb{H}^1$ of the following complex:

$$C_k^\bullet : U_k^+ \xrightarrow{\mathrm{ad}(\Phi)} U_{k+1}^- \otimes K, \tag{4.2}$$

where we use the notation

$$\begin{aligned} U_k^+ &= U_k \cap U^+, \\ U_k^- &= U_k \cap U^-, \end{aligned}$$

with U^+ and U^- as defined in (3.9). This description of the eigenspace of the Hessian of f gives rise to the long exact sequence

$$\begin{array}{lllllll} 0 & \longrightarrow \mathbb{H}^0(C_k^\bullet) & \longrightarrow & H^0(U_k^+) & \longrightarrow & H^0(U_{k+1}^- \otimes K) & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{H}^1(C_k^\bullet) \\ & & \longrightarrow & H^1(U_k^+) & \longrightarrow & H^1(U_{k+1}^- \otimes K) & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{H}^2(C_k^\bullet) & \longrightarrow & 0. \end{array} \tag{4.3}$$

Note that if some F_k has a non-zero component in both V and W this leads a decomposition of (E, Φ) and so, if (E, Φ) is stable, the F_k are alternately contained in V and W. It follows that

$$U^+ = \bigoplus_{k \text{ even}} U_k; \quad U^- = \bigoplus_{k \text{ odd}} U_k. \tag{4.4}$$

Thus we see that all the eigenvalues of the Hessian of f are even and that

$$C_{2k}^\bullet : U_{2k} \xrightarrow{\operatorname{ad}(\Phi)} U_{2k+1} \otimes K. \tag{4.5}$$

Hence we have the long exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \to \mathbb{H}^0(C_{2k}^\bullet) \to H^0(U_{2k}) \to H^0(U_{2k+1} \otimes K) \to \mathbb{H}^1(C_{2k}^\bullet) \\ \to H^1(U_{2k}) \to H^1(U_{2k+1} \otimes K) \to \mathbb{H}^2(C_{2k}^\bullet) \to 0. \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

Note that when (E, Φ) is a stable critical point we have $\mathbb{H}^0(C_{2k}^\bullet) = \mathbb{H}^2(C_{2k}^\bullet) = 0$ for $k \neq 0$, while $\mathbb{H}^2(C_0^\bullet) = 0$ and $\mathbb{H}^0(C_0^\bullet) = \mathbb{C}$. We can therefore use the exact sequence (4.6) and the Riemann–Roch formula to calculate the dimension of $\mathbb{H}^1(C_{2k}^\bullet)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \dim(\mathbb{H}^1(C_{2k}^\bullet)) &= \chi(U_{2k+1} \otimes K) - \chi(U_{2k}) \\ &= (g-1)\bigl(\operatorname{rk}(U_{2k+1}) + \operatorname{rk}(U_{2k})\bigr) + \deg(U_{2k+1}) - \deg(U_{2k}) \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

for $k \neq 0$, while for $k = 0$ we obtain

$$\dim(\mathbb{H}^1(C_0^\bullet)) = 1 + (g-1)\bigl(\operatorname{rk}(U_1) + \operatorname{rk}(U_0)\bigr) + \deg(U_1) - \deg(U_0). \tag{4.8}$$

In particular we can calculate the Morse index of f at a smooth critical point:

$$\dim\Bigl(\mathbb{H}^1\Bigl(\bigoplus_{k \geqslant 1} C_{2k}^\bullet\Bigr)\Bigr) = \sum_{k=2}^{m-1} \bigl((g-1)\operatorname{rk}(U_k) + (-1)^{k+1}\deg(U_k)\bigr). \tag{4.9}$$

Note that this is the complex dimension; thus the Morse index is twice this number. From this discussion we see that the following proposition holds.

Proposition 4.3. *A stable* $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$*-Higgs bundle of the form* (4.1) *corresponds to a local minimum of* f *if and only if*

$$\mathbb{H}^1(C^\bullet_{2k}) = 0$$

for all $k \geqslant 1$.

Definition 4.4. *Let*

$$\mathcal{N}(a,b) = \{(E,\Phi) \in \mathcal{M}(a,b) \ \mid \ \beta = 0 \ \text{ or } \ \gamma = 0\}. \tag{4.10}$$

The following is an important result for our approach that characterizes the local minima of f.

Theorem 4.5. *Let* (E,Φ) *be a polystable* $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$*-Higgs bundle in* $\mathcal{M}(a,b)$*. Then* (E,Φ) *is a local minimum of* $f\colon \mathcal{M}(a,b) \to \mathbb{R}$ *if and only if* (E,Φ) *belongs to* $\mathcal{N}(a,b)$*.*

Proof. This follows directly from Propositions 4.10, 4.11, 4.13, and 4.15, which are given in the following three sections. □

Remark 4.6. This Theorem was already known to hold when $p,q \leqslant 2$ (by the results of [19], Hitchin [23], and Xia [39]), and also when $p = q$ and $(p-1)(2g-2) < |\tau| \leqslant p(2g-2)$ by Markman-Xia [26].

Which section actually vanishes for a minimum is given by the following.

Proposition 4.7. *Let* $(E,\Phi) \in \mathcal{N}(a,b)$*. Then*

(1) $\gamma = 0 \Leftrightarrow a/p \leqslant b/q \Leftrightarrow \tau \leqslant 0$,

(2) $\beta = 0 \Leftrightarrow a/p \geqslant b/q \Leftrightarrow \tau \geqslant 0$,

In particular, $\beta = \gamma = 0$ *if and only if* $a/p = b/q$ *(i.e.* $\tau = 0$*).*

Proof. The relation between the conditions on τ and the conditions on $a/p - b/q$ follows directly from the definition of τ (cf. 3.24). By Lemma 3.18 and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta =&0 \Rightarrow a/p \geqslant b/q \\ \gamma =&0 \Rightarrow a/p \leqslant b/q. \end{aligned}$$

Since we assume that at least one of β or γ must vanish, we can use the contrapositives of these implications to infer further that

$$
\begin{aligned}
a/p > b/q &\Rightarrow \gamma = 0 \\
a/p < b/q &\Rightarrow \beta = 0
\end{aligned}
$$

It remains to check that $\beta = \gamma = 0$ if $a/p = b/q$ and (E, Φ) is polystable. We know that at least one of β and γ must vanish. Suppose that $\beta = 0$. Then $\Phi(W) = 0 \subset W \otimes K$, i.e. W is Φ-invariant. By stability, we get that $\mu(W) \leqslant \mu(E)$, with equality if and only if (E, Φ) splits as $(V, \Phi) \oplus (W, 0)$. But $\mu(W) = \mu(E)$ since $a/p = b/q$. Thus (E, Φ) splits as indicated, and hence V must be Φ-invariant. Since $\Phi(V) = \gamma(V) \subset W \otimes K$, it follows that $\gamma = 0$. A similar argument shows that $\beta = 0$ if $\gamma = 0$.

This can also conveniently be seen from the gauge theory point of view: Hitchin's equations show that the value of f on a $\mathrm{U}(p, q)$-Higgs bundle such that $\beta = 0$ is $f = \|\gamma\|^2 = q(\mu(W) - \mu(E))$, while $f = \|\beta\|^2 = p(\mu_V - \mu(E))$ if $\gamma = 0$. $\square$

Corollary 4.8. *If $a/p = b/q$ then $\mathcal{N}(a, b) \cong M(p, a) \times M(q, b)$.*

Proof. If $a/p = b/q$, then any $(E, \Phi) \in \mathcal{N}(a, b)$ has $E = V \oplus W$ and $\Phi = 0$. The polystability of (E, Φ) is thus equivalent to the polystability of V and W. $\square$

4.3 Local minima and the adjoint bundle

In this section we find a criterion for (E, Φ) to be a local minimum in terms of the adjoint bundle. We use the notation introduced in Section 4.2. Consider the complex $C^\bullet_k$ defined in (4.2) and let

$$\chi(C^\bullet_k) = \dim \mathbb{H}^0(C^\bullet_k) - \dim \mathbb{H}^1(C^\bullet_k) + \dim \mathbb{H}^2(C^\bullet_k).$$

Proposition 4.9. *Let (E, Φ) be a stable $\mathrm{U}(p, q)$-Higgs bundle which is a fixed point of the S^1-action on $\mathcal{M}(a, b)$. Then $\chi(C^\bullet_k) \leqslant 0$ and equality holds if and only if*

$$\mathrm{ad}(\Phi) \colon U^+_k \to U^-_{k+1} \otimes K$$

is an isomorphism.

Proof. For simplicity we shall adopt the notation

$$\Phi_k^{\pm} = \Phi_{|U_k^{\pm}} \colon U_k^{\pm} \longrightarrow U_{k+1}^{\mp} \otimes K.$$

The key fact we need is that there is a natural ad-invariant isomorphism $U \cong U^*$ under which we have $U^+ \cong (U^+)^*$, $U^- \cong (U^-)^*$ and $U_k^{\pm} \cong (U_{-k}^{\pm})^*$. Since $\mathrm{ad}(\Phi)^t = \mathrm{ad}(\Phi) \otimes 1_{K^{-1}}$ under this isomorphism we have

$$(\Phi_k^{\pm})^t = \Phi_{-k-1}^{\mp} \otimes 1_{K^{-1}}. \tag{4.11}$$

We have the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \ker(\Phi_k^{+}) \longrightarrow (U_{k+1}^{-} \otimes K)^* \longrightarrow \mathrm{im}(\Phi_k^{+}) \longrightarrow 0.$$

From (4.11) we have $\ker(\Phi_k^{+,t}) \cong \ker(\Phi_{-k-1}^{-}) \otimes K^{-1}$. Thus, tensoring the above sequence by K, we obtain the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \ker(\Phi_{-k-1}^{-}) \longrightarrow (U_{k+1}^{-})^* \longrightarrow \mathrm{im}(\Phi_k^{+}) \otimes K \longrightarrow 0.$$

It follows that

$$\deg(\mathrm{im}(\Phi_k^{+})) \leqslant \deg(U_{k+1}^{-}) + (2g-2)\,\mathrm{rk}(\Phi_k^{+}) + \deg(\ker(\Phi_{-k-1}^{-})).$$

Combining this inequality with the fact that

$$\deg(U_k^{+}) \leqslant \deg(\ker(\Phi_k^{+})) + \deg(\mathrm{im}(\Phi_k^{+})), \tag{4.12}$$

we obtain

$$\deg(U_k^{+}) \leqslant \deg(U_{k+1}^{-}) + (2g-2)\,\mathrm{rk}(\Phi_k^{+}) + \deg(\ker(\Phi_{-k-1}^{-})) + \deg(\ker(\Phi_k^{+})). \tag{4.13}$$

Since (E,Φ) is semistable, so is the Higgs bundle $(\mathrm{End}(E), \mathrm{ad}(\Phi))$. Clearly $\ker(\Phi_k^{\pm}) \subseteq \mathrm{End}(E)$ is Φ-invariant and hence, from semistability,

$$\deg(\ker(\Phi_k^{\pm})) \leqslant 0,$$

for all k. Substituting this inequality in (4.13), we obtain

$$\deg(U_k^{+}) \leqslant \deg(U_{k+1}^{-}) + (2g-2)\,\mathrm{rk}(\Phi_k^{+}). \tag{4.14}$$

From the long exact sequence (4.2) and the Riemann–Roch formula we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\chi(C_k^{\bullet}) &= \chi(U_k^{+}) - \chi(U_{k+1}^{-} \otimes K)\\ &= (1-g)\big(\mathrm{rk}(U_k^{+}) + \mathrm{rk}(U_{k+1}^{-})\big) + \deg(U_k^{+}) - \deg(U_{k+1}^{-}).\end{aligned}$$

Using this identity and the inequality (4.14) we see that

$$\chi(C_k^{\bullet}) \leqslant (g-1)\big(2\,\mathrm{rk}(\Phi_k^{+}) - \mathrm{rk}(U_k^{+}) - \mathrm{rk}(U_{k+1}^{-})\big).$$

Hence $\chi(C_k^{\bullet}) \leqslant 0$. Furthermore, if equality holds we have

$$\mathrm{rk}(\Phi_k^{+}) = \mathrm{rk}(U_k^{+}) = \mathrm{rk}(U_{k+1}^{-})$$

and also equality must hold in (4.14) and so $\deg(\mathrm{im}(\Phi_k^{+})) = \deg(U_{k+1}^{-} \otimes K)$, showing that Φ_k^{+} is an isomorphism as claimed. □

4.4 Stable Higgs bundles

In this section we shall prove Theorem 4.5 for stable Higgs bundles. The reducible (polystable) ones will be dealt with in the next section. We continue to use the notation of Section 4.2.

Proposition 4.10. *Let* (E, Φ) *be a stable* $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$*-Higgs bundle with* $\beta = 0$ *or* $\gamma = 0$*. Then* (E, Φ) *is a local minimum of* f*.*

Proof. If $\beta = \gamma = 0$ then clearly (E, Φ) is an absolute minimum of f. Otherwise such a Higgs bundle is a Hodge bundle of length 2, that is, $E = F_1 \oplus F_2$ with $F_1 = V$ and $F_2 = W$ (if $\beta = 0$) or vice-versa (if $\gamma = 0$). Hence $\mathrm{End}(E) = U_{-1} \oplus U_0 \oplus U_1$, in other words, $U_k = 0$ for $|k| > 1$. It follows that the complex $C_k^\bullet$ is zero for any $k > 0$ and hence all eigenvalues of the Hessian of f are positive. $\square$

The hard part is to show that any other critical point is not a local minimum of f.

Proposition 4.11. *Let* $(E, \Phi) = (F_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus F_m, \Phi)$ *be a stable* $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$*-Higgs bundle representing a critical point of* f *such that* $m \geqslant 3$*. Then* (E, Φ) *is not a local minimum of* f*.*

Proof. Note that $U_k = 0$ for $|k| \geqslant m$; in particular $U_m = 0$. Note also that, since (E, Φ) is stable, $\mathbb{H}^0(C_{m-1}^\bullet) = \mathbb{H}^2(C_{m-1}^\bullet) = 0$ (cf. the discussion at the end of Section 3.3) and therefore

$$\mathbb{H}^1(C_{m-1}^\bullet) = -\chi(C_{m-1}^\bullet). \tag{4.15}$$

We shall consider the cases when m is odd and even separately. *The case m odd.* In this case $m-1$ is even and therefore (4.4) shows that $U_{m-1}^+ = U_{m-1} \neq 0$ while $U_m^- \subseteq U_m = 0$. It therefore follows from Proposition 4.9 that $\chi(C_{m-1}^\bullet) < 0$. Hence we have

$$\mathbb{H}^1(C_{m-1}^\bullet) = -\chi(C_{m-1}^\bullet) > 0,$$

showing that (E, Φ) is not a local minimum of f.

The case m even. In this case we shall show that $\mathbb{H}^1(C_{m-2}^\bullet) \neq 0$. First note that (4.4) shows that $U_{m-2}^+ = U_{m-2}$ and $U_{m-1}^- = U_{m-1}$. Thus, using (4.15) and Proposition 4.9, we get that $\mathbb{H}^1(C_{m-2}^\bullet)$ vanishes if and only if

$$\mathrm{ad}(\Phi)\colon U_{m-2} \to U_{m-1} \otimes K$$

is an isomorphism. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} U_{m-1} &= \operatorname{Hom}(F_1, F_m) \\ U_{m-2} &= \operatorname{Hom}(F_1, F_{m-1}) \oplus \operatorname{Hom}(F_2, F_m). \end{aligned}$$

If $\operatorname{ad}(\Phi)\colon U_{m-2} \to U_{m-1} \otimes K$ is an isomorphism, the same is true for its restriction to any fibre. But, by stability of (E, Φ), the bundles F_1, F_2, F_{m-1} and F_m are all non-zero and, therefore, Lemma 4.12 below shows that $\operatorname{ad}(\Phi)\colon U_{m-2} \to U_{m-1} \otimes K$ cannot be an isomorphism. ☐

Lemma 4.12. *Let $c'\colon \mathbb{V}'_2 \to \mathbb{V}'_1$ and $c''\colon \mathbb{V}''_2 \to \mathbb{V}''_1$ be linear maps between finite dimensional vector spaces. Assume that $\mathbb{V}'_1 \oplus \mathbb{V}'_2 \neq 0$ and $\mathbb{V}''_1 \oplus \mathbb{V}''_2 \neq 0$. Define*

$$\begin{aligned} C\colon \operatorname{Hom}(\mathbb{V}''_1, \mathbb{V}'_1) \oplus \operatorname{Hom}(\mathbb{V}''_2, \mathbb{V}'_2) &\longrightarrow \operatorname{Hom}(\mathbb{V}''_2, \mathbb{V}'_1) \\ (\psi_1, \psi_2) &\longmapsto c'\psi_2 - \psi_1 c''. \end{aligned}$$

If C is an isomorphism, then exactly one of the following alternatives must occur:

1. $\mathbb{V}'_1 = \mathbb{V}''_2 = 0$ *and* $c' = c'' = 0$.
2. $\mathbb{V}''_1 = 0$, $\mathbb{V}'_1, \mathbb{V}'_2, \mathbb{V}''_2 \neq 0$ *and* $c'\colon \mathbb{V}'_2 \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathbb{V}'_1$.
3. $\mathbb{V}'_2 = 0$, $\mathbb{V}'_1, \mathbb{V}''_1, \mathbb{V}''_2 \neq 0$ *and* $c''\colon \mathbb{V}''_2 \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathbb{V}''_1$.

In particular, if $\mathbb{V}'_1$, $\mathbb{V}'_2$, $\mathbb{V}''_1$ and $\mathbb{V}''_2$ are all non-zero then C cannot be an isomorphism.

Proof. If $(c', c'') = (0, 0)$ then $C = 0$ and therefore

$$\operatorname{Hom}(\mathbb{V}''_2, \mathbb{V}'_1) = \operatorname{Hom}(\mathbb{V}''_1, \mathbb{V}'_1) = \operatorname{Hom}(\mathbb{V}''_2, \mathbb{V}'_2) = 0.$$

If $\mathbb{V}'_1 \neq 0$ then $\mathbb{V}''_1 = \mathbb{V}''_2 = 0$ which is absurd, hence $\mathbb{V}'_1 = 0$. Similarly one sees that $\mathbb{V}''_2 \neq 0$ and thus alternative (1) occurs. Henceforth assume that $(c', c'') \neq (0, 0)$. Let $r'_i = \dim \mathbb{V}'_i$ and $r''_i = \dim \mathbb{V}''_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. If C is an isomorphism then $r''_1 r'_1 + r''_2 r'_2 = r''_2 r'_1$ from which it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} r''_2(r'_1 - r'_2) &= r''_1 r'_1, \\ r'_1(r''_2 - r''_1) &= r''_2 r'_2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$r'_1 \geqslant r'_2, \tag{4.16}$$

$$r''_2 \geqslant r''_1. \tag{4.17}$$

Assume that we have strict inequality in (4.16) and (4.17). Then, in particular, $\mathrm{im}(c')$ and $\ker(c'')$ must both be non-zero. Choose a complement to $\mathrm{im}(c')$ in $\mathbb{V}'_1$ so that

$$\mathbb{V}'_1 = \mathrm{im}(c') \oplus \mathrm{im}(c')^{\perp}.$$

We then have an inclusion

$$\mathrm{Hom}(\ker(c''), \mathrm{im}(c')^{\perp}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{V}''_2, \mathbb{V}'_1).$$

Let $\psi = (\psi_1, \psi_2) \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{V}''_1, \mathbb{V}'_1) \oplus \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{V}''_2, \mathbb{V}'_2)$ and $x \in \ker(c'')$, then

$$C(\psi)(x) = c'\psi_2(x) - \psi_1 c'(x) = c'\psi_2(x),$$

which belongs to $\mathrm{im}(c')$. Hence $\mathrm{im}(C)$ and $\mathrm{Hom}(\ker(c''), \mathrm{im}(c')^{\perp})$ have trivial intersection and, therefore, C cannot be an isomorphism, which is absurd. It follows that equality must hold in at least one of the inequalities (4.16) and (4.17). Suppose that equality holds in (4.16) then $r''_1 r'_1 = 0$. Suppose first that $r'_1 = 0$, i.e. $\mathbb{V}'_1 = 0$, then $\mathbb{V}'_2 \neq 0$ and, since $c' = 0$, we also have $c'' \neq 0$. It follows that $\mathbb{V}'_2 \neq 0$, $\mathbb{V}''_2 \neq 0$ and that $C(\psi_1, \psi_2) = -\psi_1 c''$. Since C is an isomorphism this shows that alternative (2) occurs. In a similar manner one sees that if equality holds in (4.17) then alternative (3) occurs. Obviously the three alternatives are mutually exclusive. □

4.5 Reducible Higgs bundles

In this section we shall finally conclude the proof of Theorem 4.5 by showing that it also holds for reducible Higgs bundles. First we shall show that a reducible Higgs bundle which is not of the form given in Theorem 4.5 cannot be a local minimum of f; for this we use an argument similar to the one given by Hitchin [24, §8] for the case of $\mathrm{PSL}(n, \mathbb{R})$.

Proposition 4.13. *Let* (E, Φ) *be a reducible* $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$*-Higgs bundle. If* $\beta \neq 0$ *and* $\gamma \neq 0$ *then* (E, Φ) *is not a local minimum of* f*.*

Proof. We know that (E, Φ) is a direct sum of stable $\mathrm{U}(p', q')$-Higgs bundles of lower rank. Since $f(E, \Phi)$ is the sum of the values of f on each of the summands (on the corresponding lower rank moduli space), it follows that each of these stable summands is a local minimum of f on the lower rank moduli space. In particular, (E, Φ) is a fixed point of the circle action. Therefore, by Proposition 4.10, each stable direct summand has $\beta = 0$ or $\gamma = 0$. Hence we can choose two stable direct summands (E', Φ') and (E'', Φ'') such that $\gamma' \neq 0$ and $\beta'' \neq 0$ and $\beta' = \gamma'' = 0$. It is clearly sufficient to show that $(E' \oplus E'', \Phi' \oplus \Phi'')$ is not a local minimum of f on the corresponding moduli space and we can therefore assume that $(E, \Phi) = (E' \oplus E'', \Phi' \oplus \Phi'')$ without loss of generality.

Let $\mathcal{C}$ denote the configuration space of all solutions to Hitchin's equations and let $(A_0, \Phi_0) \in \mathcal{C}$ be the gauge theory object corresponding to (E, Φ). As in Section 4.2 we denote by $\psi = \dot{g}$ the infinitesimal gauge transformation counteracting the circle action. We can write $\psi = \psi' + \psi''$, where ψ' and ψ'' are infinitesimal gauge transformations of (E', Φ') and (E'', Φ'') respectively; recall that we may assume that $\operatorname{tr}(\psi') = \operatorname{tr}\psi'' = 0$. The calculations of [24, §8] show that if $\alpha(t) = (A_t, \Phi_t)$ is a smooth curve in $\mathcal{C}$ such that (A_0, Φ_0) represents a fixed point of the circle action then $(f \circ \alpha)'(0) = 0$. Furthermore, if $\alpha'(0) = (\dot{A}, \dot{\Phi})$ is a tangent vector to $\mathcal{C}$ at (A_0, Φ_0) and ψ acts on $\dot{A}$ with weight λ and on $\dot{\Phi}$ with weight ν then

$$(f \circ \alpha)''(0) = -\lambda c_1 - (\nu - 1)c_2$$

for strictly positive constants c_1 and c_2.

Suppose that we have a family (E_t, Φ_t) of polystable Higgs bundles such that $(E_0, \Phi_0) = (E, \Phi)$ and let $\alpha(t) = (A_t, \Phi_t)$ be the corresponding family of solutions to Hitchin's equations. Then the holomorphic structure on E_t is given by the $(0,1)$-part of A, while the holomorphic Φ coincides with its gauge theory counterpart and hence the weight of ψ on $(\dot{A}, \dot{\Phi})$ coincides with its weight on $(\dot{E}, \dot{\Phi})$.

This provides a criterion for proving that a given fixed point is not a minimum: it will be sufficient to find a 1-parameter family (E_t, Φ_t) of polystable Higgs bundles such that $(E_0, \Phi_0) = (E, \Phi)$ and such that $(\dot{E}, \dot{\Phi})$ lies in a direct sum of strictly positive weight spaces for ψ. In fact we shall construct a family such that $\dot{\Phi} = 0$ and thus we simply need to consider the tangent vector $\dot{E} \in H^1(\operatorname{End}(E))$ at 0 to the family E_t. Recall from Section 4.2 that we have decompositions $E' = \bigoplus F'_k$ and $E'' = \bigoplus F''_k$ into eigenspaces of ψ. Clearly we have

$$\begin{aligned} F'_1 &= V' \ , & F'_2 &= W' \ , \\ F''_1 &= W'' \ , & F''_2 &= V'' \ . \end{aligned}$$

Let λ'_V and λ'_W be the weights of the action of ψ on V' and W' respectively, and analogously for E''. We then have that

$$\lambda'_W = \lambda'_V + 1 \ , \qquad\qquad \lambda''_V = \lambda''_W + 1 \ .$$

and, since $\operatorname{tr}(\psi)' = \operatorname{tr}(\psi)'' = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda'_V p' + \lambda'_W q' = 0 \ , \\ \lambda''_V p'' + \lambda''_W q'' = 0 \ , \end{aligned}$$

where $p' = \operatorname{rk}(V')$, $q' = \operatorname{rk}(W')$, $p'' = \operatorname{rk}(V'')$ and $q'' = \operatorname{rk}(W'')$. From these equations we conclude that

$$\lambda'_W - \lambda''_W = \frac{p'}{p'+q'} + \frac{p''}{p''+q''} > 0 \ , \tag{4.18}$$

$$\lambda''_V - \lambda'_V = \frac{q''}{p''+q''} + \frac{q'}{p'+q'} > 0 \ . \tag{4.19}$$

Hence the subspaces $H^1(\operatorname{Hom}(W'', W'))$ and $H^1(\operatorname{Hom}(V', V''))$ of $H^1(\operatorname{End}(E))$ have strictly positive weights and it will suffice for us to construct a family (E_t, Φ_t) as described above such that $\dot{E}$ lies in the direct sum of these two spaces and $\dot{\Phi} = 0$. For this argument to be valid it is of course essential for this direct sum to be non-zero; in fact it is proved in Lemma 4.14 below that both $H^1(\operatorname{Hom}(W'', W'))$ and $H^1(\operatorname{Hom}(V', V''))$ are non-vanishing. In order to find such a family we adapt the construction of such a family used in the proof of Proposition 4.3 of [19] (for $\mathrm{SU}(2,2)$-Higgs bundles): Let $\eta \in H^1(\operatorname{Hom}(V', V''))$ and $\sigma \in H^1(\operatorname{Hom}(W'', W))$ be non-zero; we can then define a deformation of (E, Φ) by using that η defines an extension

$$0 \longrightarrow V'' \longrightarrow V^\eta \longrightarrow V' \longrightarrow 0 \ ,$$

while σ defines an extension

$$0 \longrightarrow W' \longrightarrow W^\sigma \longrightarrow W'' \longrightarrow 0 \ .$$

Let $E^{(\eta,\sigma)} = V^\eta \oplus W^\sigma$ and define $\Phi^{(\eta,\sigma)}$ by the compositions

$$\begin{aligned} b^{(\eta,\sigma)} &\colon W^\sigma \longrightarrow W'' \xrightarrow{b''} V'' \to V^\eta \ , \\ c^{(\eta,\sigma)} &\colon V^\eta \longrightarrow V' \xrightarrow{c'} W' \longrightarrow W^\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $(E^0, \Phi^0) = (E, \Phi)$ (the Higgs fields agree since $b' = c'' = 0$). Now define the family $(E_t, \Phi_t) = (E^{(\eta t, \sigma t)}, \Phi^{(\eta t, \sigma t)})$. It is then clear that $\dot{E} = (\eta, \sigma)$.

In order to see that $\dot{\Phi} = 0$ we simply note that our definition of $\Phi^{(\eta,\sigma)}$ did not change the Higgs field but only the holomorphic structure on the bundles: thus the reason why the Higgs field stays holomorphic with respect to the deformed holomorphic structure is that $\beta' = \gamma'' = 0$.

In order to conclude the proof we still need to show that (E_t, Φ_t) is a polystable Higgs bundle for each t. It is in fact easy to see that $(E^{\eta,\sigma}, \Phi^{\eta,\sigma})$ is stable: the essential point is that the destabilizing subbundles V' and W'' of (E, Φ) are not subbundles of the deformed Higgs bundle. We leave the details to the reader. $\square$

Lemma 4.14. *The cohomology groups* $H^1(\mathrm{Hom}(V', V''))$ *and* $H^1(\mathrm{Hom}(W'', W'))$ *are both non-vanishing.*

Proof. Since $\gamma'' = 0$, V'' is a Φ-invariant subbundle of E'' and therefore $\mu(V'') < \mu(E'') = \mu(E')$. Using the Riemann–Roch formula we therefore obtain

$$\begin{aligned} h^0(\mathrm{Hom}(V', V'') - h^1(\mathrm{Hom}(V', V'') &= p'p''(1 - g + \mu(V'') - \mu(V')) \\ &< p'p''(1 - g + \mu(E') - \mu(V')). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathrm{rk}(\beta') \leqslant p'$ the inequality (3.22) of Corollary 3.20 shows that $\mu(E') - \mu(V') \leqslant g - 1$ and we therefore deduce that

$$h^0(\mathrm{Hom}(V', V'') - h^1(\mathrm{Hom}(V', V'') < 0,$$

from which it follows that $H^1(\mathrm{Hom}(V', V'') \neq 0$. Similarly one sees that $H^1(\mathrm{Hom}(W'', W')) \neq 0$. $\square$

In order to finish the proof of Theorem 4.5 we only need to show that any reducible $\mathrm{U}(p, q)$-Higgs bundle with $\beta = 0$ or $\gamma = 0$ is a local minimum of f.

Proposition 4.15. *Let* (E, Φ) *be a reducible* $\mathrm{U}(p, q)$*-Higgs bundle with* $\beta = 0$ *or* $\gamma = 0$*. Then* (E, Φ) *is a local minimum of* f*.*

Proof. Recall from (4.10) that $\mathcal{N}(a, b)$ is the subspace of polystable $\mathrm{U}(p, q)$-Higgs bundles in $\mathcal{M}(a, b)$ with $\beta = 0$ or $\gamma = 0$. From Proposition 4.7 we know that if $a/p > b/q$ then $\beta = 0$ and $f(\mathcal{N}(a, b)) = q(\mu(W) - \mu(E))$. Since we know that $\mathcal{M}(a, b) \smallsetminus \mathcal{N}(a, b)$ does not contain any local minima of f and that f has a global minimum on $\mathcal{M}(a, b)$ it follows that this global minimum is exactly $f(\mathcal{N}(a, b))$ and, therefore, $f(\mathcal{N}(a, b))$ consists of local minima of f. Of course a similar argument applies if $a/p < b/q$.

Finally, if $a/p = b/q$ then we know from Proposition 4.7 that $\Phi = 0$ and hence $f(\mathcal{N}(a,b)) = 0$, showing that $\mathcal{N}(a,b)$ consists of (global) minima of the positive function f. $\square$

4.6 Local minima and connectedness

Denote by $\mathcal{M}^s(a,b) \subseteq \mathcal{M}(a,b)$ and $\mathcal{N}^s(a,b) \subseteq \mathcal{N}(a,b)$ the subspaces consisting of stable $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundles, and denote by $\bar{\mathcal{M}}^s(a,b)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{N}}^s(a,b)$ their respective closures. In this section we explain how to obtain connectedness results on $\mathcal{M}^s(a,b)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{M}}^s(a,b)$.

The invariants (a,b) will be fixed in the following and we shall occasionally drop them from the notation and write $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}(a,b)$, etc.

Proposition 4.16. *The closure of $\mathcal{N}^s$ in $\mathcal{M}$ coincides with $\bar{\mathcal{N}}^s$ and*

$$\bar{\mathcal{N}}^s = \bar{\mathcal{M}}^s \cap \mathcal{N} .$$

Proof. Clear. $\square$

Now consider the restriction of the Morse function to $\bar{\mathcal{M}}^s$,

$$f \colon \bar{\mathcal{M}}^s \to \mathbb{R} .$$

since $\bar{\mathcal{M}}^s$ is closed in $\mathcal{M}$ the restriction of f remains proper.

Proposition 4.17. *The restriction of f to $\bar{\mathcal{M}}^s$ is proper and the subspace of local minima of this function coincides with $\bar{\mathcal{N}}^s$.*

Proof. Properness of the restriction follows from properness of f and the fact that $\bar{\mathcal{M}}^s$ is closed in $\mathcal{M}$.

We know that f is constant on $\mathcal{N}$ and that its value on this subspace is the global minimum of f on $\mathcal{M}$. Thus $\bar{\mathcal{N}}^s$ is contained in the subspace of local minima of f.

It remains to see that there are no other local minima of the restriction of f to $\bar{\mathcal{M}}^s$. We already know that the subspace of local minima on $\mathcal{M}^s$ is $\mathcal{N}^s$. Now, $\mathcal{M}^s$ is open in $\bar{\mathcal{M}}^s$ so there cannot be any additional local minima on $\mathcal{M}$.

Thus all we we need to prove is that there are no local minima of f in $(\bar{\mathcal{M}}^s \smallsetminus \mathcal{M}^s) \smallsetminus \bar{\mathcal{N}}^s$. So let (E, Φ) be a strictly poly-stable $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundle representing a point in this space, then from Proposition 4.16 we see that $\beta \neq 0$ and $\gamma \neq 0$. In the proof of Proposition 4.13 we constructed a family

(E_t, Φ_t) of $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundles such that $(E, \Phi) = (E_0, \Phi_0)$ and (E_t, Φ_t) is stable for $t \neq 0$. Furthermore we showed that the restriction of f to this family does not have a local minimum at (E_0, Φ_0). It follows that (E, Φ) is not a local minimum of f on $\bar{\mathcal{M}}^s$. □

Proposition 4.18. (1) *If $\mathcal{N}(a,b)$ is connected, then so is $\mathcal{M}(a,b)$.*

(2) *If $\mathcal{N}^s(a,b)$ is connected, then so is $\bar{\mathcal{M}}^s(a,b)$.*

Proof. (1) In view of Proposition 4.2, this follows from Theorem 4.5.

(2) If $\mathcal{N}^s(a,b)$ is connected, then so is its closure $\bar{\mathcal{N}}^s(a,b)$. But from Proposition 4.17, $\bar{\mathcal{N}}^s(a,b)$ is the subspace of local minima of the proper positive map $f\colon \bar{\mathcal{M}}^s(a,b) \to \mathbb{R}$. Hence the result follows from Proposition 4.1. □

5 Stable triples

5.1 Definitions and basic facts

We briefly recall the relevant definitions for holomorphic triples as studied in [6] and [15]; we refer to these papers for details. A *holomorphic triple* on X, $T = (E_1, E_2, \phi)$ consists of two holomorphic vector bundles E_1 and E_2 on X and a holomorphic map $\phi\colon E_2 \to E_1$. A homomorphism from $T' = (E_1', E_2', \phi')$ to $T = (E_1, E_2, \phi)$ is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
E_2' \arrow[r, "\phi'"] \arrow[d] & E_1' \arrow[d] \\
E_2 \arrow[r, "\phi"] & E_1.
\end{tikzcd}$$

$T' = (E_1', E_2', \phi')$ is a subtriple of $T = (E_1, E_2, \phi)$ if the homomorphisms of sheaves $E_1' \to E_1$ and $E_2' \to E_2$ are injective. For any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ the *α-degree* and *α-slope* of T are defined to be

$$\begin{aligned}
\deg_\alpha(T) &= \deg(E_1) + \deg(E_2) + \alpha\,\mathrm{rk}(E_2), \\
\mu_\alpha(T) &= \frac{\deg_\alpha(T)}{\mathrm{rk}(E_1) + \mathrm{rk}(E_2)} \\
&= \mu(E_1 \oplus E_2) + \alpha \frac{\mathrm{rk}(E_2)}{\mathrm{rk}(E_1) + \mathrm{rk}(E_2)}.
\end{aligned}$$

The triple $T = (E_1, E_2, \phi)$ is *α-stable* if

$$\mu_\alpha(T') < \mu_\alpha(T)$$

for any proper sub-triple $T' = (E_1', E_2', \phi')$. Sometimes it is convenient to use

$$\Delta_\alpha(T') = \mu_\alpha(T') - \mu_\alpha(T), \tag{5.1}$$

in terms of which the α-stability of T is equivalent to $\Delta_\alpha(T') < 0$ for any proper sub-triple T'. We define *α-semistability* by replacing the above strict inequality with a weak inequality. A triple is called *α-polystable* if it is the direct sum of α-stable triples of the same α-slope. Write $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, n_2)$ and $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, d_2)$. We denote by

$$\mathcal{N}_\alpha = \mathcal{N}_\alpha(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}) = \mathcal{N}_\alpha(n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2)$$

the moduli space of α-polystable triples $T = (E_1, E_2, \phi)$ with $\mathrm{rk}(E_i) = n_i$ and $\deg(E_i) = d_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. The subspace of α-stable triples is denoted by $\mathcal{N}_\alpha^s$. We refer to $(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}) = (n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2)$ as the *type* of the triple. Like in the Higgs bundle case, the stability condition for triples arises in relation to some gauge-theoretic equations, known as the *vortex equations*. Namely, given a triple $T = (E_1, E_2, \phi)$, one is looking for hermitian metrics H_1 and H_2 on E_1 and E_2, respectively, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{-1}\Lambda F(E_1) + \phi\phi^* &= \tau_1 \operatorname{Id}_{E_1}, \\ \sqrt{-1}\Lambda F(E_2) - \phi^*\phi &= \tau_2 \operatorname{Id}_{E_2}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

where Λ is contraction by the Kähler form of a metric on X normalized so that $\mathrm{vol}(X) = 2\pi$, $F(E_i)$ is the curvature of the unique connection on E_i compatible with h_i and the holomorphic structure of E_i, and τ_1 and τ_2 are real parameters satisfying $d_1 + d_2 = n_1\tau_1 + n_2\tau_2$. A solution to (5.2) exists if and only if T is α-polystable for $\alpha = \tau_1 - \tau_2$ ([6]). There are certain necessary conditions in order for α-semistable triples to exist. Let $\mu_i = d_i/n_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. We define

$$\alpha_m = \mu_1 - \mu_2, \tag{5.3}$$

$$\alpha_M = (1 + \frac{n_1 + n_2}{|n_1 - n_2|})(\mu_1 - \mu_2), \quad n_1 \neq n_2. \tag{5.4}$$

One has the following ([6, 15]).

Proposition 5.1. *The moduli space $\mathcal{N}_\alpha(n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2)$ is a complex analytic variety, which is projective when α is rational. A necessary condition for $\mathcal{N}_\alpha(n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2)$ to be non-empty is*

$$0 \leqslant \alpha_m \leqslant \alpha \leqslant \alpha_M \quad \textit{if} \quad n_1 \neq n_2,$$

$$0 \leqslant \alpha_m \leqslant \alpha \quad \textit{if} \quad n_1 = n_2.$$

The moduli space of triples for $\alpha = \alpha_m$ is given by the following.

Proposition 5.2. *A triple $T = (E_1, E_2, \phi)$ is α_m-polystable if and only if $\phi = 0$ and E_1 and E_2 are polystable. We thus have*

$$\mathcal{N}_{\alpha_m}(n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2) \cong M(n_1, d_1) \times M(n_2, d_2).$$

Proof. Consider equations (5.2) on T. If $\alpha = \alpha_m$ then $\tau_1 = \mu_1$ and $\tau_2 = \mu_2$ and hence in order to have solutions of (5.2) we must have $\phi = 0$. In this case, (5.2) say that the hermitian metrics on E_1 and E_2 have constant central curvature. But this is equivalent to the polystability of E_1 and E_2 by the theorem of Narasimhan and Seshadri [28]. □

Remark 5.3. If $\alpha_m = 0$ and $n_1 \neq n_2$ then $\alpha_m = \alpha_M = 0$ and the moduli space of α stable triples is empty unless $\alpha = 0$.

Given a triple $T = (E_1, E_2, \phi)$ one can define the dual triple $T^* = (E_2^*, E_1^*, \phi^*)$, where E_i^* is the dual of E_i and ϕ^* is the transpose of ϕ. It is not difficult to prove ([6]) that the α-(semi)stability of T is equivalent to the α-(semi)stability of T^*. The map $T \mapsto T^*$ defines then an isomorphism

$$\mathcal{N}_\alpha(n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2) = \mathcal{N}_\alpha(n_2, n_1, -d_2, -d_1).$$

This can be used to restrict our study to $n_1 \geqslant n_2$ and appeal to duality to deal with the other case. A triple $T = (E_1, E_2, \phi)$ is strictly α-semistable if and only if it has a subtriple $T' = (E_1', E_2', \phi')$ such that

$$\mu(E_1' \oplus E_2') + \alpha \frac{n_2'}{n_1' + n_2'} = \mu(E_1 \oplus E_2) + \alpha \frac{n_2}{n_1 + n_2} \ . \tag{5.5}$$

There are two ways in which this can happen: the first one is if there exists a subtriple T' such that

$$\frac{n_2'}{n_1' + n_2'} = \frac{n_2}{n_1 + n_2} \ ,$$
$$\mu(E_1' \oplus E_2') = \mu(E_1 \oplus E_2) \ .$$

In this case the terms containing α drop from (5.5) and T is strictly α-semistable for all values of α. We refer to this phenomenon as *α-independent semistability.* This cannot happen if $\mathrm{GCD}(n_2, n_1 + n_2, d_1 + d_2) = 1$. The other way in which strict α-semistability can happen is if equality holds in (5.5) but

$$\frac{n_2'}{n_1'+n_2'} \neq \frac{n_2}{n_1+n_2} \ . \tag{5.6}$$

The values of $\alpha \in [\alpha_m, \infty)$ for which this happens are called *critical values.* For such an α there exists (n_1', n_2', d_1', d_2') such that

$$\frac{d_1'+d_2'}{n_1'+n_2'} + \alpha\frac{n_2'}{n_1'+n_2'} = \frac{d_1+d_2}{n_1+n_2} + \alpha\frac{n_2}{n_1+n_2}.$$

In other words,

$$\alpha = \frac{(n_1+n_2)(d_1'+d_2') - (n_1'+n_2')(d_1+d_2)}{n_1'n_2 - n_1n_2'}$$

with $n_i' \leqslant n_i$, $(n_1', n_2', d_1', d_2') \neq (n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2)$, $(n_1', n_2') \neq (0,0)$ and $n_1'n_2 \neq n_1n_2'$. We say that α is *generic* if it is not critical. We thus have the following (cf. [6]).

Proposition 5.4. *(1) There is only a discrete number of critical values of $\alpha \in [\alpha_m, \infty)$ for given (n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2).*

(2) If $n_1 \neq n_2$ the number of critical values is finite and lies in the interval $[\alpha_m, \alpha_M]$.

(3) The stability criteria for two values of α lying between two consecutive critical values are equivalent; thus the corresponding moduli spaces are isomorphic.

(4) If α is generic and $\mathrm{GCD}(n_2, n_1+n_2, d_1+d_2) = 1$ then α-semistability is equivalent to α-stability.

Let $\alpha_m^+ = \alpha_m + \epsilon$, with ϵ such that the interval $(\alpha_m, \alpha_m^+]$ does not contain any critical value (sometimes we refer to this value of α as *small.* The following is important in the construction of the moduli space for small α.

Proposition 5.5 ([6]). *If a triple $T = (E_1, E_2, \phi)$ is α_m^+-semistable triple, E_1 and E_2 are semistable. In the converse direction, if E_1 or E_2 is stable and the other is semistable, $T = (E_1, E_2, \phi)$ is α_m^+-stable.*

Corollary 5.6. *If $\mathrm{GCD}(n_1, d_1) = 1$ and $\mathrm{GCD}(n_2, d_2) = 1$, the moduli space $\mathcal{N}^s_{\alpha_m^+}(n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2)$ is isomorphic to the projectivization of a Picard sheaf over $M(n_1, d_1) \times M(n_2, d_2)$.*

Proof. Let $\mathbb{E}_1$ and $\mathbb{E}_2$ the universal bundles over $X \times M(n_1, d_1)$ and $X \times M(n_2, d_2)$, respectively. Consider the canonical projections $\pi : X \times M(n_1, d_1) \times M(n_2, d_2) \to M(n_1, d_1) \times M(n_2, d_2)$; $\hat{\pi} : X \times M(n_1, d_1) \times M(n_2, d_2) \to X$; $\pi_1 : X \times M(n_1, d_1) \times M(n_2, d_2) \to X \times M(n_1, d_1)$; and $\pi_2 : X \times M(n_1, d_1) \times M(n_2, d_2) \to X \times M(n_2, d_2)$. From Proposition 5.5 we deduce that

$$\mathcal{N}^s_{\alpha_m^+}(n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2) = \mathbb{P}(R^1\pi_*(\pi_1^*\mathbb{E}_1 \otimes \pi_2^*\mathbb{E}_2^* \otimes \hat{\pi}^*K)^*).$$

□

It is important for us to have criteria to rule out strict α-semistability when α is an integer.

Lemma 5.7. *Let m be an integer such that* $\mathrm{GCD}(n_1+n_2, d_1+d_2-mn_1) = 1$. *Then*

1. *$\alpha = m$ is not a critical value,*
2. *there are no α-independent semistable triples.*

Proof. To prove (1), suppose that $\alpha = m$ is a critical value. There exist then a triple T and a proper subtriple T' so that

$$(d_1' + d_2' + mn_2')(n_1 + n_2) = (d_1 + d_2 + mn_2)(n_1' + n_2').$$

This means in particular that $n_1 + n_2$ divides $(d_1 + d_2 + mn_2)(n_1' + n_2')$ and since $n_1 + n_2 > n_1' + n_2'$ we must have that $\mathrm{GCD}(n_1 + n_2, d_1 + d_2 + mn_2) > 1$. But, since $d_1 + d_2 + mn_2 = d_1 + d_2 - mn_1 + m(n_1 + n_2)$, we have $\mathrm{GCD}(n_1 + n_2, d_1 + d_2 - mn_1) > 1$, in contradiction with the hypothesis. To prove (2), we will show that $\mathrm{GCD}(n_2, n_1 + n_2, d_1 + d_2) = 1$, from which the result follows by (4) in Proposition 5.4. Suppose that $\mathrm{GCD}(n_2, n_1 + n_2, d_1 + d_2) \neq 1$. Then there is (n_2', n', d') such that $\frac{n_2'}{n_1'+n_2'} = \frac{n_2}{n_1+n_2}$ and $\frac{d_1'+d_2'}{n_1'+n_2'} = \frac{d_1+d_2}{n_1+n_2}$. It follows that

$$\frac{d_1' + d_2' - mn_1'}{n_1' + n_2'} = \frac{d_1 + d_2 - mn_1}{n_1 + n_2},$$

and hence $\mathrm{GCD}(n_1 + n_2, d_1 + d_2 - mn_1) \neq 1$, in contradiction with the hypothesis. □

5.2 Minima as triples

Let (E, Φ) be a $\mathrm{U}(p, q)$-Higgs bundle with $\gamma = 0$. We can then define a holomorphic triple $T = (E_1, E_2, \phi)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} E_1 &= V \otimes K \\ E_2 &= W, \\ \phi &= \beta; \end{aligned}$$

and given a holomorphic triple we can define an associated $\mathrm{U}(p, q)$-Higgs bundle with $\gamma = 0$. Similarly, there is a bijective correspondence between $\mathrm{U}(p, q)$-Higgs bundles with $\beta = 0$ and holomorphic triples given by

$$\begin{aligned} E_1 &= W \otimes K, \\ E_2 &= V \\ \phi &= \gamma. \end{aligned}$$

The link between the stability conditions for holomorphic triples and $\mathrm{U}(p, q)$-Higgs bundles is given by the following result.

Proposition 5.8. *A* $\mathrm{U}(p, q)$*-Higgs bundle* (E, Φ) *with* $\beta = 0$ *or* $\gamma = 0$ *is (semi)stable if and only if the corresponding holomorphic triple* $T = (E_1, E_2, \phi)$ *is* α*-(semi)stable for* $\alpha = 2g - 2$.

Proof. For definiteness we shall assume that $\gamma = 0$ (of course, the same argument applies if $\beta = 0$). We then have $E_1 = V \otimes K$ and $E_2 = W$ and, hence,

$$\deg(E_1) = \deg(V) + p(2g - 2).$$

Since $p = \mathrm{rk}(E_1)$ and $q = \mathrm{rk}(E_2)$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_\alpha(T) &= \frac{\deg(V) + \deg(W) + p(2g - 2) + \alpha q}{p + q} \\ &= \mu(E) + \frac{p}{p + q}(2g - 2) + \frac{q}{p + q}\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

If we set $\alpha = 2g - 2$ we therefore have

$$\mu_\alpha(T) = \mu(E) + 2g - 2. \tag{5.7}$$

Clearly the correspondence between holomorphic triples and $\mathrm{U}(p, q)$-Higgs bundles gives a correspondence between sub-triples $T' = (E_1', E_2', \phi')$ and

Φ-invariant subbundles of E which respect the decomposition $E = V \oplus W$ (i.e., subbundles $E' = V' \oplus W'$ with $V' \subseteq V$ and $W' \subseteq W$). It was shown in Section 2.3 of [19] that (E, Φ) is (semi)stable if and only if the (semi)stability condition holds for Φ-invariant subbundles which respect the decomposition $E = V \oplus W$. On the other hand, it follows from (5.7) that

$$\mu(E') < \mu(E)$$

if and only if

$$\mu_\alpha(T') < \mu_\alpha(T)$$

(and similarly for semistability), thus concluding the proof. □

Recall that $\mathcal{M}(a,b)$ is the space of polystable $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundles with $\deg(V) = a$ and $\deg(W) = b$. We have the following important characterization of the subspace of local minima of f on $\mathcal{M}(a,b)$.

Theorem 5.9. *Let $\mathcal{N}(a,b)$ be the subspace of local minima of f on $\mathcal{M}(a,b)$.*

1. *If $a/p \leqslant b/q$ then*

   $$\mathcal{N}(a,b) \cong \mathcal{N}_{2g-2}(p,q,a+p(2g-2),b),$$

   the moduli space of α-polystable triples with $n_1 = p$, $n_2 = q$, $d_1 = a + p(2g-2)$, $d_2 = b$, and $\alpha = 2g-2$.

2. *If $a/p \geqslant b/q$ then*

   $$\mathcal{N}(a,b) \cong \mathcal{N}_{2g-2}(q,p,b+q(2g-2),a),$$

   the moduli space of α-polystable triples with $n_1 = q$, $n_2 = p$, $d_1 = b + q(2g-2)$, $d_2 = a$, and $\alpha = 2g-2$.

3. *If $a/p = b/q$ then*

   $$\mathcal{N}(a,b) \cong M(p,a) \times M(q,b),$$

   where $M(p,a)$ is the moduli space of polystable bundles of rank p and degree a, and $M(q,b)$ is the moduli space of polystable bundles of rank q and degree b.

Proof. It is obtained by combining Theorem 4.5, Proposition 4.7, Proposition 5.8 and Corollary 4.8. □

Remark 5.10. If $a/p = b/q$ then $2g-2$ is equal to the extreme value, α_m, for triples of type $(p, q, a + p(2g-2), b)$ and also for triples of type $(q, p, b + q(2g-2), a)$. Thus by Proposition 5.2 the descriptions of $\mathcal{N}(a, b)$ in (1) and (2) of Theorem 5.9 coincide with each other and agree with that in (3).

Theorem 5.11. (1) *Let $a/p \leqslant b/q$.*

  - *If $\mathcal{N}_{2g-2}(p, q, a + p(2g-2), b)$ is connected then $\mathcal{M}(a, b)$ is connected.*
  - *If $\mathcal{N}^s_{2g-2}(p, q, a + p(2g-2), b)$ is connected then $\bar{\mathcal{M}}^s(a, b)$ is connected.*

(2) *Let $a/p \geqslant b/q$.*

  - *If $\mathcal{N}_{2g-2}(q, p, b + q(2g-2), a)$ is connected then $\mathcal{M}(a, b)$ is connected.*
  - *If $\mathcal{N}^s_{2g-2}(q, p, b + q(2g-2), a)$ is connected then $\bar{\mathcal{M}}^s(a, b)$ is connected.*

(3) *If $a/p = b/q$ then $\mathcal{M}(a, b)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{M}}^s(a, b)$ are connected.*

Proof. It follows from Proposition 4.18 and Theorem 5.9. For (3) we also use that the moduli spaces of semistable bundles $M(p, a)$ and $M(q, b)$ are connected, and that the moduli spaces of stable bundles $M^s(p, a)$ and $M^s(q, b)$ are connected (in fact these moduli spaces are irreducible.) □

In view of Theorem 5.9, it is important to understand where $2g-2$ lies in the range (given by Proposition 5.1) for the stability parameter α.

Proposition 5.12. *Let (n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2) be the type of the triples arising from $\mathcal{N}(a, b)$, as in Theorem 5.9. Let τ be the Toledo invariant as in* (3.24).

(1) *$2g-2 \geqslant \alpha_m$, with equality if and only if $\tau = 0$.*

(2) *If $p \neq q$ then the Milnor–Wood inequality $|\tau| \leqslant \min\{p, q\}(2g-2)$ is equivalent to the condition $2g-2 \leqslant \alpha_M$. Moreover, $2g-2 = \alpha_M$ if and only if $|\tau| = \min\{p, q\}(2g-2)$.*

(3) *If $p = q$, then the Milnor–Wood inequality is equivalent to the condition $\alpha_m \geqslant 0$. Moreover $\alpha_m = 0$ if and only if $|\tau| = p(2g-2)$.*

Proof. Let $(E, \Phi) \in \mathcal{N}(a, b)$. We assume that $a/p \geqslant b/q$, i.e. $\tau \geqslant 0$ (the case $a/p \leqslant b/q$ is analogous). Then $\mu_1 = b/q + 2g - 2$, $\mu_2 = a/p$, and hence $\alpha_m = \mu_1 - \mu_2 = b/q - a/p + 2g - 2$. We thus have $\alpha_m \leqslant 2g - 2$. Hence, the Toledo invariant (3.24) is

$$\tau = \frac{2pq}{p+q}(\frac{a}{p} - \frac{b}{q}) = \frac{2pq}{p+q}(2g - 2 - \alpha_m), \tag{5.8}$$

from which we see that $\alpha_m \leqslant 2g-2$ is equivalent to $\tau \geqslant 0$ and, in particular, $\alpha_m = 2g - 2$ if and only if $\tau = 0$. This proves (1). From (5.8) we see that $\alpha_m \geqslant 0$ is equivalent to

$$\tau \leqslant \frac{2pq}{p+q}(2g - 2). \tag{5.9}$$

If $p = q$ then (5.9) is equivalent to $\tau \leqslant p(2g - 2)$, which is the Milnor–Wood inequality, proving (2). If $p \neq q$, then (5.9) is weaker than the Milnor–Wood inequality. But in this case α_M is an upper bound for α and in order to have existence we must assume

$$2g - 2 \leqslant \alpha_M. \tag{5.10}$$

Suppose that $p > q$ (the case $p < q$ is analogous), then $\alpha_M = \frac{2p}{p-q}\alpha_m$ and hence (5.8) can be written as

$$\tau = \frac{2pq}{p+q}(2g - 2 - \frac{p-q}{2p}\alpha_M). \tag{5.11}$$

Hence, from (5.11) we see that (5.10) is equivalent to $\tau \leqslant q(2g - 2)$, and in particular we have $2g-2 = \alpha_M$ if and only if $\tau = q(2g-2)$. Which conludes the proof of (3). $\square$

Remark 5.13. The above proposition gives another explanation for the Milnor–Wood inequality in Corollary 3.21. Using the fact that the non-emptiness of $\mathcal{M}(a, b)$ is equivalent to the non-emptiness of either $\mathcal{N}_{2g-2}(p, q, a+p(2g-2), b)$ or $\mathcal{N}_{2g-2}(q, p, b + q(2g - 2), a)$, we see that the Milnor–Wood inequality is equivalent to the condition that $2g - 2$ lies within the range where α-polystable triples of the given kind exist. From this, we see that in order to study $\mathcal{N}(a, b)$ for different values of the Toledo invariant, we have to study the moduli space of triples for α that may be lying anywhere in the α-range, including in the extreme values α_m and α_M.

The rest of the paper is devoted to this question. The strategy we adopt is the following: When $p \neq q$, and assuming that $2g-2$ is not an extreme, we give a explicit birational description of what we call the *large* moduli space. This is the moduli space for $\alpha_M^- = \alpha_M - \epsilon$, for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough so that there is no any critical value in $[\alpha_M^-, \alpha_M)$. Once we have identified this, we need to study the changes that happen when we cross a critical value. We do this with all the critical values until we get to $\alpha = 2g-2$. When $p = q$ there is no upper bound for α but it turns out that the moduli space remains unchanged after a certain value of α (Sec. 9.3). We can thus apply the same principle as before taking this as the *large* moduli space.

5.3 Extensions and deformations of triples

Let $T' = (E'_1, E'_2, \phi')$ and $T'' = (E''_1, E''_2, \phi'')$ be two triples and, as usual, let

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}') &= (n'_1, n'_2, d'_1, d'_2),\\ (\mathbf{n}'', \mathbf{d}'') &= (n''_1, n''_2, d''_1, d''_2),\end{aligned}$$

where $n'_i = \deg(E'_i)$, $n''_i = \deg(E''_i)$, $d'_i = \deg(E'_i)$ and $d''_i = \deg(E''_i)$. Let $\mathrm{Hom}(T'', T')$ denote the linear space of homomorphisms from T'' to T', and let $\mathrm{Ext}^1(T'', T')$ denotes the linear space of extensions of the form

$$0 \longrightarrow T' \longrightarrow T \longrightarrow T'' \longrightarrow 0.$$

In order to analyse $\mathrm{Ext}^1(T'', T')$ one considers the complex of sheaves

$$C^\bullet(T'', T') \colon E_1''^* \otimes E'_1 \oplus E_2''^* \otimes E'_2 \xrightarrow{c} E_2''^* \otimes E'_1, \tag{5.12}$$

where the map c is defined by

$$c(\psi_1, \psi_2) = \phi'\psi_2 - \psi_1\phi''.$$

Proposition 5.14. *There are natural isomorphisms*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Hom}(T'', T') &\cong \mathbb{H}^0(C^\bullet(T'', T')),\\ \mathrm{Ext}^1(T'', T') &\cong \mathbb{H}^1(C^\bullet(T'', T')),\end{aligned}$$

and a long exact sequence associated to the complex $C^\bullet(T'', T')$:

$$\begin{array}{rlcl}0 & \longrightarrow \mathbb{H}^0(C^\bullet(T'', T')) & \longrightarrow & H^0(E_1''^* \otimes E'_1 \oplus E_2''^* \otimes E'_2) \longrightarrow H^0(E_2''^* \otimes E'_1)\\ & \longrightarrow \mathbb{H}^1(C^\bullet(T'', T')) & \longrightarrow & H^1(E_1''^* \otimes E'_1 \oplus E_2''^* \otimes E'_2) \longrightarrow H^1(E_2''^* \otimes E'_1)\\ & \longrightarrow \mathbb{H}^2(C^\bullet(T'', T')) & \longrightarrow & 0.\end{array} \tag{5.13}$$

Proof. A proof can be given by using cocycle representatives of the hypercohomology classes, in a manner similar to what is done in the study of deformations ([5]). In fact the result is a special case of a much more general result proved in [20]. □

We introduce the following notation:

$$\begin{aligned} h^i(T'', T') &= \dim \mathbb{H}^i(C^\bullet(T'', T')), \\ \chi(T'', T') &= h^0(T'', T') - h^1(T'', T') + h^2(T'', T'). \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 5.15. *For any holomorphic triples T' and T'' we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(T'', T') &= \chi(E_1''^* \otimes E_1') + \chi(E_2''^* \otimes E_2') - \chi(E_2''^* \otimes E_1') \\ &= (1-g)(n_1''n_1' + n_2''n_2' - n_2''n_1') \\ &\quad + n_1''d_1' - n_1'd_1'' + n_2''d_2' - n_2'd_2'' - n_2''d_1' + n_1'd_2''. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Immediate from the long exact sequence (5.13) and the Riemann–Roch formula. □

Corollary 5.16. *For any extension $0 \to T' \to T \to T'' \to 0$ of triples,*

$$\chi(T, T) = \chi(T', T') + \chi(T'', T'') + \chi(T'', T') + \chi(T', T'').$$

□

Remark 5.17. Proposition 5.15 shows that $\chi(T'', T')$ depends only on the topological invariants $(\mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}')$ and $(\mathbf{n}'', \mathbf{d}'')$ of T' and T''. Whenever convenient we shall therefore use the notation

$$\chi(\mathbf{n}'', \mathbf{d}'', \mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}') = \chi(T'', T').$$

The following vanishing results for $\mathbb{H}^0$ and $\mathbb{H}^2$ play a central role in our problem.

Proposition 5.18. *Suppose that T' and T'' are α-semistable.*

1. *If $\mu_\alpha(T') < \mu_\alpha(T'')$ then $\mathbb{H}^0(C^\bullet(T'', T')) \cong 0$*
2. *If $\mu_\alpha(T') = \mu_\alpha(T'')$ and T'' is α-stable, then*

$$\mathbb{H}^0(C^\bullet(T'', T')) \cong \begin{cases} \mathbb{C} & \textit{if } T' \cong T'' \\ 0 & \textit{if } T' \not\cong T''. \end{cases}$$

Proof. By Proposition 5.14 we can identify $\mathbb{H}^0(C^\bullet(T'', T'))$ with $\mathrm{Hom}(T'', T')$. The statements (1) and (2) are thus the direct analogs for triples of the same results for semistable bundles. The proof is identical. Suppose that we can find a $h : T'' \to T'$ is a non-trivial homorphism of triples $h : T'' \to T'$. If $T' = (E_1', E_2', \Phi')$ and $T'' = (E_1'', E_2'', \Phi'')$ then h is given by a pair of bundle maps $u_i : E_i'' \to E_i''$ for $i = 1, 2$ such that $\Phi' \circ u_2 = u_1 \circ \Phi''$. We can thus define subtriples of T'' and T' respectively by $T_N = (\ker(u_1), \ker(u_2), \Phi'')$ and $T_I = (\mathrm{im}(u_1), \mathrm{im}(u_2), \Phi')$, where in T_I, it is in general necessary to take the saturations of the image $\mathrm{im}(u_1)$ and $\mathrm{im}(u_2)$. By the semistability conditions, we get

$$\mu_\alpha(T_N) \leqslant \mu_\alpha(T'') \leqslant \mu_\alpha(T_I) \leqslant \mu_\alpha(T') \ .$$

The conclusions follow directly from this. □

Proposition 5.19. *Suppose that triples T' and T'' are α-semistable with $\mu_\alpha(T') = \mu_\alpha(T'')$. Then*

1. $\mathbb{H}^2(C^\bullet(T'', T')) = 0$ *whenever* $\alpha > 2g - 2$.
2. *If one of* T', T'' *is* $\alpha + \epsilon$*-stable for some* $\epsilon \geqslant 0$, *then* $\mathbb{H}^2(C^\bullet(T'', T')) = 0$ *whenever* $\alpha \geqslant 2g - 2$.

Proof. From (5.13) it is clear that the vanishing of $\mathbb{H}^2(C^\bullet(T'', T'))$ is equivalent to the surjectivity of the map

$$H^1(E_1''^* \otimes E_1' \oplus E_2''^* \otimes E_2') \longrightarrow H^1(E_2''^* \otimes E_1') \ .$$

By Serre duality this is equivalent to the injectivity of the map

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H^0(E_1'^* \otimes E_2'' \otimes K) & \xrightarrow{P} & H^0(E_1'^* \otimes E_1'' \otimes K) \oplus H^0(E_2'^* \otimes E_2'' \otimes K) \\ \psi & \longmapsto & ((\phi'' \otimes \mathrm{Id}) \circ \psi, \psi \circ \phi'). \end{array} \tag{5.14}$$

Proof of (1): Suppose that P is not injective. Then there is a non-trivial homomorphism $\psi : E_1' \to E_2'' \otimes K$ in $\ker P$. Let $I = \mathrm{im}\,\psi$ and $N = \ker \psi$. Since $(\phi'' \otimes \mathrm{Id}_K) \circ \psi = 0$, $I \subset \ker \phi''$ and hence $T_I'' = (0, I \otimes K^*, 0)$ is a proper subtriple of T''. Similarly, the fact that $\psi \circ \phi' = 0$ implies that $\mathrm{im}\,\phi' \subset N$ and thus $T_N' = (\ker \psi, E_2', \phi')$ is a proper subtriple of T'. Let $k = \mathrm{rk}(N)$ and $l = \deg(N)$. Then, from the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow N \longrightarrow E_1' \longrightarrow I \longrightarrow 0.$$

we see that $\mathrm{rk}(I) = n_1' - k$ and $\deg(I) = d_1' - l$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_\alpha(T_N') &= \frac{l + d_2'}{k + n_2'} + \alpha\frac{n_2'}{k + n_2'},\\ \mu_\alpha(T_I'') &= \frac{d_1' - l}{n_1' - k} + 2 - 2g + \alpha.\end{aligned}$$

Adding these two expressions, and clearing denominators we see that

$$d_1' + d_2' + (n_1' - k)(2 - 2g) + \alpha(n_1' + n_2' - k) = (k + n_2')\mu_\alpha(T_N') + (n_1' - k)\mu_\alpha(T_I'').$$

But $\mu_\alpha(T_N') \leqslant \mu_\alpha(T')$, $\mu_\alpha(T_I'') \leqslant \mu_\alpha(T'')$ and $\mu_\alpha(T') = \mu_\alpha(T'')$. From this we obtain that

$$d_1' + d_2' + (n_1' - k)(2 - 2g) + \alpha(n_1' + n_2' - k) \leqslant d_1' + d_2' + \alpha n_2' \ , \tag{5.15}$$

and hence

$$\alpha(n_1' - k) \leqslant (n_1' - k)(2g - 2) \ .$$

Since $n_1' - k > 0$ we get that $\alpha \leqslant 2g - 2$. Hence P must be injective if the hypotheses of the part (1) of the proposition are satisfied.

Proof of (2): Suppose that T'' is $\alpha + \epsilon$-stable for some $\epsilon \geqslant 0$. It follows that $\mu_{\alpha+\epsilon}(T_I'') < \mu_{\alpha+\epsilon}(T'')$, i.e

$$\mu_\alpha(T_I'') - \mu_\alpha(T'') < \epsilon(\frac{n_2''}{n_1'' + n_2''} - 1) \leqslant 0 \ .$$

Thus, following exactly the same argument as in the proof of (1), we get a strict inequality in (5.15). We conclude that that if P is not injective then $\alpha < 2g - 2$, i.e. if $\alpha \geqslant 2g - 2$ then P must be injective. If T' is $\alpha + \epsilon$-stable for some $\epsilon \geqslant 0$ then we get that

$$\mu_\alpha(T_N') - \mu_\alpha(T') < \epsilon(\frac{n_2'}{n_1' + n_2'} - \frac{n_2'}{k + n_2'}) \leqslant 0 \ .$$

The rest of the argument is the same as in the case that T'' is $\alpha+\epsilon$-stable. □

Corollary 5.20. *Let T' and T'' be two holomorphic triples.*

(1) $\dim \mathrm{Ext}^1(T'', T') = h^0(T'', T') + h^2(T'', T') - \chi(T'', T')$.

(2) *If T' and T'' are α-semistable, $\mu_\alpha(T') = \mu_\alpha(T'')$, and $\alpha > 2g-2$, then*

$$\dim \operatorname{Ext}^1(T'', T') = h^0(T'', T') - \chi(T'', T').$$

The same holds for $\alpha \geqslant 2g-2$ if in addition T' or T'' is $\alpha+\epsilon$-stable for some $\epsilon \geqslant 0$.

Since the space of infinitesimal deformations of T is isomorphic to $\mathbb{H}^1(C^\bullet(T,T))$, these considerations also apply to studying deformations of a holomorphic triple T. To be precise, one has the following.

Theorem 5.21. *Let $T = (E_1, E_2, \phi)$ be an α-stable triple of type (n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2).*

(1) *The Zariski tangent space at the point defined by T is isomorphic to*

$$\mathbb{H}^1(C^\bullet(T,T)).$$

(2) *If $\mathbb{H}^2(C^\bullet(T,T)) = 0$, then the moduli space of α-stable triples is smooth in a neighbourhood of the point defined by T.*

(3) *$\mathbb{H}^2(C^\bullet(T,T)) = 0$ if and only if the homomorphism*

$$H^1(E_1^* \otimes E_1 \oplus E_2^* \otimes E_2) \longrightarrow H^1(E_2^* \otimes E_1)$$

in the corresponding long exact sequence is surjective.

(4) *At a smooth point $T \in \mathcal{N}_\alpha^s(n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2)$ the dimension of the moduli space of α-stable triples is*

$$\begin{aligned} \dim \mathcal{N}_\alpha^s(n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2) &= h^1(T,T) = 1 - \chi(T,T) \\ &= (g-1)(n_1^2 + n_2^2 - n_1 n_2) - n_1 d_2 + n_2 d_1 + 1. \end{aligned} \tag{5.16}$$

(5) *If ϕ is injective or surjective then $T = (E_1, E_2, \phi)$ defines a smooth point in the moduli space.*

(6) *If $\alpha \geqslant 2g-2$, then T defines a smooth point in the moduli space, and hence $\mathcal{N}_\alpha^s(n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2)$ is smooth.*

Proof. Statements (1) and (2) are proved in [6] (see also [5]). (3) follows from the long exact sequence (5.13) with $T = T' = T''$. (4) follows from (1), (2) and Propositions 5.15 and 5.20. (5) is proved in [6, Prop. 6.3]. (6) is a consequence of Proposition 5.19. □

6 Crossing critical values

In this section we study the differences between the stable loci $\mathcal{N}^s_\alpha(\mathbf{n},\mathbf{d})$ in the moduli spaces $\mathcal{N}_\alpha(\mathbf{n},\mathbf{d})$, for fixed values of $\mathbf{n}=(n_1,n_2)$ and $\mathbf{d}=(d_1,d_2)$ but different values of α. Since in this section $\mathbf{n}$ and $\mathbf{d}$ are fixed, we use the abbreviated notation

$$\mathcal{N}^s_\alpha = \mathcal{N}^s_\alpha(\mathbf{n},\mathbf{d}) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathcal{N}_\alpha = \mathcal{N}_\alpha(\mathbf{n},\mathbf{d}) \ .$$

Our main result is that for all $\alpha \geqslant 2g-2$ any differences between the $\mathcal{N}^s_\alpha$ are confined to subvarieties of positive codimension. In particular, the number of components and the irreducibility properties of the spaces $\mathcal{N}^s_\alpha$ are the same for all α satisfying $\alpha \geqslant 2g-2$ and $\alpha_m < \alpha < \alpha_M$[3]. If the coprimality condition $\mathrm{GCD}(n_2, n_1+n_2, d_1+d_2)=1$ is satisfied, then $\mathcal{N}^s_\alpha = \mathcal{N}_\alpha$ at all non-critical vales of α, so the results apply to $\mathcal{N}_\alpha$ for all non-critical $\alpha \geqslant 2g-2$.

We begin with a set theoretic description of the differences between two spaces $\mathcal{N}^s_{\alpha_1}$ and $\mathcal{N}^s_{\alpha_2}$ when α_1 and α_2 are separated by a critical value (as defined in section 5.1). For the rest of this section we adopt the following notation: Let α_c be a critical value such that

$$\alpha_m < \alpha_c < \alpha_M \ . \tag{6.1}$$

Set

$$\alpha_c^+ = \alpha_c + \epsilon \quad , \quad \alpha_c^- = \alpha_c - \epsilon \ , \tag{6.2}$$

where $\epsilon > 0$ is small enough so that α_c is the only critical value in the interval (α_c^-, α_c^+).

6.1 Flip Loci

Definition 6.1. *Let $\alpha_c \in (\alpha_m, \alpha_M)$ be a critical value for triples of type $(\mathbf{n},\mathbf{d})$. We define flip loci $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_c^\pm} \subset \mathcal{N}^s_{\alpha_c^\pm}$ by the conditions that the points in $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_c^+}$ represent triples which are α_c^+-stable but α_c^--unstable, while the points in $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_c^-}$ represent triples which are α_c^--stable but α_c^+-unstable.*

Remark 6.2. The definition of $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_c^+}$ can be extended to the extreme case $\alpha_c = \alpha_m$. However, since all α_m^+-stable triples must be α_m^--unstable, we see that $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_m^+} = \mathcal{N}^s_{\alpha_m^+}$. Similarly, when $n_1 \neq n_2$ we get $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_M^-} = \mathcal{N}^s_{\alpha_M^-}$. The only interesting cases are thus those those for which $\alpha_m < \alpha_c < \alpha_M$.

---

[3] When $n_1 \neq n_2$ the bounds α_m and α_M are as in (5.3) and (5.3). When $n_1 = n_2$ we adpot the convention that $\alpha_M = \infty$

Lemma 6.3. *In the above notation:*

$$\mathcal{N}^s_{\alpha_c^+} - \mathcal{S}_{\alpha_c^+} = \mathcal{N}^s_{\alpha_c} = \mathcal{N}^s_{\alpha_c^-} - \mathcal{S}_{\alpha_c^-} \ . \tag{6.3}$$

Proof. By definition we can identify $\mathcal{N}^s_{\alpha_c^+} - \mathcal{S}_{\alpha_c^+} = \mathcal{N}^s_{\alpha_c^-} - \mathcal{S}_{\alpha_c^-}$.

Suppose now that t is a point in $\mathcal{N}^s_{\alpha_c^+} - \mathcal{S}_{\alpha_c^+} = \mathcal{N}^s_{\alpha_c^-} - \mathcal{S}_{\alpha_c^-}$, but that t is not in $\mathcal{N}^s_{\alpha_c}$. Let T be a triple representing t. Then T has a subtriple $T' \subseteq T$ for which $\mu_{\alpha_c}(T') \geqslant \mu_{\alpha_c}(T)$, and also $\mu_{\alpha_c^\pm}(T') < \mu_{\alpha_c^\pm}(T)$. This is not possible, and hence $t \in \mathcal{N}^s_{\alpha_c}$.

Finally, suppose that $t \in \mathcal{N}^s_{\alpha_c}$ and let T be a triple representing t. Then $\mu_{\alpha_c}(T') < \mu_{\alpha_c}(T)$ for all subtriples $T' \subset T$. But since the set of possible values for $\mu_{\alpha_c}(T')$ is a discrete subset of $\mathbb{R}$, we can find a $\delta > 0$ such that $\mu_{\alpha_c}(T') - \mu_{\alpha_c}(T) \leqslant -\delta$ for all subtriples $T' \subset T$. Thus $\mu_{\alpha_c^\pm}(T') - \mu_{\alpha_c^\pm}(T) < 0$. That is, t is in $\mathcal{N}^s_{\alpha^\pm}$, and hence $\mathcal{N}^s_\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{N}^s_{\alpha^\pm} - \mathcal{S}_{\alpha^\pm}$. ☐

Our goal is to show that the flip loci $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_c^\pm}$ are contained in subvarieties of positive codimension in $\mathcal{N}^s_{\alpha_c^\pm}$ respectively.

Proposition 6.4. *Let $\alpha_c \in (\alpha_m, \alpha_M)$ be a critical value for triples of type $(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}) = (n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2)$. Let $T = (E_1, E_2, \phi)$ be a triple of this type.*

1. *Suppose that T represents a point in $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_c^+}$, i.e. suppose that T is α_c^+-stable but α_c^--unstable. Then T has a description as the middle term in an extension*

$$0 \to T' \to T \to T'' \to 0 \tag{6.4}$$

   in which

   - *(a) T' and T'' are both α_c^+-stable, with $\mu_{\alpha_c^+}(T') < \mu_{\alpha_c^+}(T)$,*
   - *(b) T' and T'' are both α_c-semistable with $\mu_{\alpha_c}(T') = \mu_{\alpha_c}(T)$,*
   - *(c) $\frac{n_2'}{n_1'+n_2'}$ is a maximum among all proper subtriples $T' \subset T$ which satisfy* (b),
   - *(d) $n_1' + n_2'$ is a minimum among all subtriples which satisfy* (c).

2. *Similarly, if T represents a point in $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_c^-}$, i.e. if T is α_c^--stable but α_c^+-unstable, then T has a description as the middle term in an extension* (6.4) *in which*

   - *(a) T' and T'' are both α_c^--stable with $\mu_{\alpha_c^-}(T') < \mu_{\alpha_c^-}(T)$,*
   - *(b) T' and T'' are both α_c-semistable with $\mu_{\alpha_c}(T') = \mu_{\alpha_c}(T)$,*

(c) $\frac{n'_2}{n'_1+n'_2}$ *is a minimum among all proper subtriples* $T' \subset T$ *which satisfy* (b),

(d) $n'_1 + n'_2$ *is a minimum among all subtriples which satisfy* (c).

Proof. In both cases (i.e. (1) and (2)), since its stability property changes at α_c, the triple T must be strictly α_c-semistable, i.e. it must have a proper subtriple T' with $\mu_{\alpha_c}(T') = \mu_{\alpha_c}(T)$. We can thus consider the (non-empty) set

$$\mathcal{F}_1 = \{T' \subsetneq T \mid \mu_{\alpha_c}(T') = \mu_{\alpha_c}(T)\ \}.$$

(*Proof of (1)*) Suppose first that T is α_c^+-stable but α_c^--unstable. We observe that if $T' \in \mathcal{F}_1$, then $\frac{n'_2}{n'_1+n'_2} < \frac{n_2}{n_1+n_2}$, since otherwise T could not be α_c^+-stable. But the allowed values for $\frac{n'_2}{n'_1+n'_2}$ are limited by the constraints $0 \leqslant n'_1 \leqslant n_1$, $0 \leqslant n'_2 \leqslant n_2$ and $n'_1 + n'_2 \neq 0$. We can thus define

$$\lambda_0 = \max\left\{ \frac{n'_2}{n'_1+n'_2} \;\middle|\; T' \in \mathcal{F}_1 \right\}$$

and set

$$\mathcal{F}_2 = \left\{ T_1 \subset \mathcal{F}_1 \;\middle|\; \frac{n'_2}{n'_1+n'_2} = \lambda_0 \right\}.$$

Now let T' be any triple in $\mathcal{F}_2$. Since T' has maximal α_c-slope, we can assume that $T'' = T/T'$ is a locally free triple, i.e. if $T'' = (E''_2, E''_1, \Phi)$ then E''_2 and E''_1 are both locally free. Furthermore, since T is α_c-semistable and $\mu_{\alpha_c}(T') = \mu_{\alpha_c}(T) = \mu_{\alpha_c}(T'')$, it follows that both T' and T'' are α_c-semistable and of the same α_c-slope. We now show that T'' is α_c^+-stable. Suppose not. Then there is a proper subtriple $\tilde{T}'' \subset T''$ with $\mu_{\alpha_c^+}(\tilde{T}'') \geqslant \mu_{\alpha_c^+}(T'')$. However, since we can assume that α_c^+ is not a critical value for triples of type $(\tilde{T}'')$, we must have

$$\mu_{\alpha_c^+}(\tilde{T}'') > \mu_{\alpha_c^+}(T'')\ .$$

Thus, since (T'') is α_c-semistable, we must have

- $\mu_{\alpha_c}(\tilde{T}'') \leqslant \mu_{\alpha_c}(T'')$
- $\frac{\tilde{n}''_2}{\tilde{n}''_1+\tilde{n}''_2} > \frac{n''_2}{n''_1+n''_2}$

If $\mu_{\alpha_c}(\tilde{T}'') < \mu_{\alpha_c}(T'')$, say $\mu_{\alpha_c}(\tilde{T}'') = \mu_{\alpha_c}(T'') - \delta$, then in order to have $\mu_{\alpha_c^+}(\tilde{T}'') > \mu_{\alpha_c^+}(T'')$ we must have

$$\frac{\tilde{n}''_2}{\tilde{n}''_1+\tilde{n}''_2} > \frac{n''_2}{n''_1+n''_2} + \frac{\delta}{\epsilon}\ .$$

Letting ϵ approach zero, we see that $\frac{\tilde{n}_2''}{\tilde{n}_1''+\tilde{n}_2''}$ must be arbitrarily large. This cannot be if $0 \leqslant \tilde{n}_1'' \leqslant n_1''$ and $0 \leqslant \tilde{n}_2'' \leqslant n_2''$ (and $\tilde{n}_1'' + \tilde{n}_2'' > 0$). We may thus assume that $\mu_{\alpha_c}(\tilde{T}'') = \mu_{\alpha_c}(T'')$. Consider now the subtriple $\tilde{T}' \subset T$ defined by the pull-back diagram

$$0 \to T' \to \tilde{T}' \to \tilde{T}'' \to 0 \ .$$

This has $\mu_{\alpha_c}(\tilde{T}') = \mu_{\alpha_c}(T'') = \mu_{\alpha_c}(T)$ and thus

$$\frac{\tilde{n}_2'}{\tilde{n}_1' + \tilde{n}_2'} \leqslant \lambda_0 = \frac{n_2'}{n_1' + n_2'} \ .$$

It follows from this and the above extension that

$$\frac{\tilde{n}_2''}{\tilde{n}_1'' + \tilde{n}_2''} \leqslant \lambda_0 = \frac{n_2'}{n_1' + n_2'} \ .$$

However, since $\mu_{\alpha_c}(T') = \mu_{\alpha_c}(T)$ but $\mu_{\alpha_c^+}(T') < \mu_{\alpha_c^+}(T)$, we have that

$$\frac{n_2'}{n_1' + n_2'} < \frac{n_2''}{n_1'' + n_2''} \ .$$

Combining the previous two inequalities we get

$$\frac{\tilde{n}_2''}{\tilde{n}_1'' + \tilde{n}_2''} < \frac{n_2''}{n_1'' + n_2''}$$

which is a contradiction. Now take $T' \in \mathcal{F}_2$ with *minimum rank (i.e. minimum* $n_1' + n_2'$*) in* $\mathcal{F}_2$. We claim that T' is α_c^+-stable. If not, then as before it has a proper subtriple $\tilde{T}'$ with

- $\mu_{\alpha_c}(\tilde{T}') \leqslant \mu_{\alpha_c}(T')$
- $\frac{\tilde{n}_2'}{\tilde{n}_1'+\tilde{n}_2'} > \frac{n_2'}{n_1'+n_2'}$.

But then $\tilde{n}_1' + \tilde{n}_2' < n_1' + n_2'$, which contradicts the minimality of $n_1' + n_2'$. Thus T' is α_c^+-stable. Moreover, since T is α_c^+-stable it follows that $\mu_{\alpha_c^+}(T') < \mu_{\alpha_c^+}(T)$. Thus taking $T' \in \mathcal{F}_2$ with minimum rank, and $T'' = T/T'$, we get a description of T as an extension in which (a)-(d) are satisfied.

Proof of (2). If T is α_c^--stable but α_c^+-unstable, then $\frac{n_2'}{n_1'+n_2'} > \frac{n_2}{n_1+n_2}$ for all $T' \in \mathcal{F}_1$. The proof of (i) must thus be modified as follows. With

$$\lambda_0 = \min \left\{ \frac{n_2'}{n_1' + n_2'} \ \middle| \ T' \in \mathcal{F}_1 \right\}$$

we can define

$$\mathcal{F}_2 = \left\{ T' \subset \mathcal{F}_1 \;\middle|\; \frac{n'_2}{n'_1 + n'_2} = \lambda_0 \right\}$$

and select $T' \in \mathcal{F}_2$ such that T' has minimal rank in $\mathcal{F}_2$. It follows in a similar fashion to that above that T has a description as

$$0 \to T' \to T \to T'' \to 0$$

in which all the requirements of the proposition are satisfied. □

Remark 6.5. Unlike for Jordan-Holder filtrations for semistable objects, the filtrations produced by the above proposition are always of length two, i.e. always yield a description of the semistable object as an extension of stable objects. This is achieved by exploiting the extra 'degree of freedom' provided by the parameter α_c. The true advantage of never having to consider extensions of length greater than two is that it removes the need for inductive procedures in the analysis of the flip loci.

Definition 6.6. *Let $\alpha_c \in (\alpha_m, \alpha_M)$ be a critical value for triples of type $(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d})$. Let $(\mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}') = (n'_1, n'_2, d'_1, d'_2)$ and $(\mathbf{n}'', \mathbf{d}'') = (n''_1, n''_2, d''_1, d''_2)$ be such that*

$$(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}) = (\mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}') + (\mathbf{n}'', \mathbf{d}'') \;, \tag{6.5}$$

(i.e. $n_1 = n'_1 + n''_1$, $n_2 = n'_2 + n''_2$, $d_1 = d'_1 + d''_1$, and $d_2 = d'_2 + d''_2$), and also

$$\frac{d'_1 + d'_2}{n'_1 + n'_2} + \alpha_c \frac{n'_2}{n'_1 + n'_2} = \frac{d''_1 + d''_2}{n''_1 + n''_2} + \alpha_c \frac{n''_2}{n''_1 + n''_2}. \tag{6.6}$$

1. *Define $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{\alpha_c^+}(\mathbf{n}'', \mathbf{d}'', \mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}')$ to be the set of all isomorphism classes of extensions*

   $$0 \longrightarrow T' \longrightarrow T \longrightarrow T'' \longrightarrow 0,$$

   where T' and T'' are α_c^+-stable triples with topological invariants $(\mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}')$ and $(\mathbf{n}'', \mathbf{d}'')$ respectively, and the isomorphism is on the triple T.

2. *Define $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}^0_{\alpha_c^+}(\mathbf{n}'', \mathbf{d}'', \mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}') \subset \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{\alpha_c^+}(\mathbf{n}'', \mathbf{d}'', \mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}')$ to be the set of all extensions for which moreover T is α_c^+-stable. In an analogous manner, define $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{\alpha_c^-}(\mathbf{n}'', \mathbf{d}'', \mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}')$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}^0_{\alpha_c^-}(\mathbf{n}'', \mathbf{d}'', \mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}') \subset \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{\alpha_c^+}(\mathbf{n}'', \mathbf{d}'', \mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}')$.*

3. *Define*

   $$\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{\alpha_c^+} = \bigcup \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{\alpha_c^+}(\mathbf{n}'', \mathbf{d}'', \mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}') \;,\; \tilde{\mathcal{S}}^0_{\alpha_c^+} = \bigcup \tilde{\mathcal{S}}^0_{\alpha_c^+}(\mathbf{n}'', \mathbf{d}'', \mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}')$$

where the union is over all (n'_1, n'_2, d'_1, d'_2) *and* $(n''_1, n''_2, d''_1, d''_2)$ *such that the above conditions apply, and also* $\frac{n'_2}{n'_1+n'_2} < \frac{n''_2}{n''_1+n''_2}$.

4. *Similarly, define*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{\alpha_c^-} = \bigcup \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{\alpha_c^-}(\mathbf{n}'', \mathbf{d}'', \mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}') \ , \ \tilde{\mathcal{S}}^0_{\alpha_c^-} = \bigcup \tilde{\mathcal{S}}^0_{\alpha_c^-}(\mathbf{n}'', \mathbf{d}'', \mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}')$$

where the union is over all (n'_1, n'_2, d'_1, d'_2) *and* $(n''_1, n''_2, d''_1, d''_2)$ *such that the above conditions apply, and also* $\frac{n'_2}{n'_1+n'_2} > \frac{n''_2}{n''_1+n''_2}$.

Remark 6.7. It can happen that $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}^0_{\alpha_c^-}$ or $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}^0_{\alpha_c^-}$ is empty. For instance there may be no possible choices of (n'_1, n'_2, d'_1, d'_2) and $(n''_1, n''_2, d''_1, d''_2)$ which satisfy all the required conditions. In this case, the implication of the next lemma is that one or both of the flip loci $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_c^\pm}$ is empty.

Lemma 6.8. *There are maps, say* $v^\pm : \tilde{\mathcal{S}}^0_{\alpha_c^\pm} \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}^s_{\alpha_c^\pm}$, *which map triples to their equivalence classes. The images contain the flip loci* $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_c^\pm}$.

Proof. The existence of the maps is clear. The second statement, about the images of the maps, follows by Proposition 6.4. Indeed, suppose that T represents a point in $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_c^+}$ and that

$$0 \to T' \to T \to T'' \to 0$$

is an extension of the type described in proposition 6.4, with T' a triple of type $(\mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}')$ and T'' a triple of type $(\mathbf{n}'', \mathbf{d}'')$. Then $(\mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}')$ and $(\mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}')$ satisfy conditions (6.5) and (6.6). Furthermore, since $\mu_{\alpha_c^+}(T') < \mu_{\alpha_c^+}(T'')$, we must have $\frac{n'_2}{n'_1+n'_2} < \frac{n''_2}{n''_1+n''_2}$. Thus T is contained in $v^+(\tilde{\mathcal{S}}^0_{\alpha_c^+})$. A similar argument shows that $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_c^+}$ is contained in $v^-(\tilde{\mathcal{S}}^0_{\alpha_c^-})$ □

6.2 Codimension Estimates

Let $\alpha_c \in (\alpha_m, \alpha_M)$ be a critical value for triples of type $(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d})$. Fix $(\mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}') = (n'_1, n'_2, d'_1, d'_2)$ and $(\mathbf{n}'', \mathbf{d}'') = (n''_1, n''_2, d''_1, d''_2)$ as in Definition 6.6. For simplicity we shall denote the moduli spaces of $\alpha_c^\pm$-semistable triples of topological type $(\mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}')$, respectively $(\mathbf{n}'', \mathbf{d}'')$, by

$$\mathcal{N}'_{\alpha_c^\pm} = \mathcal{N}_{\alpha_c^\pm}(\mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}') \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{N}''_{\alpha_c^\pm} = \mathcal{N}_{\alpha_c^\pm}(\mathbf{n}'', \mathbf{d}'').$$

Proposition 6.9. *If* $\alpha_c \geqslant 2g-2$ *then the space* $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{\alpha_c^\pm}(\mathbf{n}'', \mathbf{d}'', \mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}')$ *is a locally trivial fibration over* $\mathcal{N}'_{\alpha_c^\pm} \times \mathcal{N}''_{\alpha_c^\pm}$, *with projective fibers of dimension*

$$-\chi(\mathbf{n}'', \mathbf{d}'', \mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}') - 1 \ .$$

In particular, $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{\alpha_c^\pm}(\mathbf{n}'', \mathbf{d}'', \mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}')$ *has dimension*

$$1 - \chi(\mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}', \mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}') - \chi(\mathbf{n}'', \mathbf{d}'', \mathbf{n}'', \mathbf{d}'') - \chi(\mathbf{n}'', \mathbf{d}'', \mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}') \ ,$$

where $\chi(\mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}', \mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}')$ *etc. are as in section 5.3.*

Proof. From the defining properties of $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{\alpha_c^\pm}(\mathbf{n}'', \mathbf{d}'', \mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}')$ there is map

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{\alpha_c^\pm}(\mathbf{n}'', \mathbf{d}'', \mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}') \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}'_{\alpha_c^\pm} \times \mathcal{N}''_{\alpha_c^\pm} \tag{6.7}$$

which sends an extension

$$0 \to T' \to T \to T'' \to 0$$

to the pair $([T'], [T''])$, where $[T']$ denotes the class represented by T' and similarly for $[T'']$. We first examine the fibers of this map.

Notice that T' and T'' satisfy the hypothesis of Proposition 5.19 and therefore of Corollary 5.20. Notice moreover that, since $\mu_{\alpha_c^\pm}(T') < \mu_{\alpha_c^\pm}(T'')$, it is not possible to have $T' \cong T''$. Thus (cf. Corollary 5.20 and Proposition 5.18(2)) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \dim\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{Ext}^1(T'', T')) &= \dim\mathrm{Ext}^1(T'', T') - 1 \\ &= -\chi(T'', T') - 1 \\ &= -\chi(\mathbf{n}'', \mathbf{d}'', \mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}') - 1 \ , \end{aligned} \tag{6.8}$$

which is independent of T' and T''. It remains to establish that the fibration (6.7) is locally trivial. If the coprime conditions $\mathrm{GCD}(n'_1, n'_2, d'_1 + d'_2) = 1 = \mathrm{GCD}(n''_1, n''_2, d''_1 + d''_2)$ hold then the moduli spaces $\mathcal{N}'_{\alpha_c^\pm}$ and $\mathcal{N}''_{\alpha_c^\pm}$ are fine moduli spaces (cf. [30]). That is, there are universal objects, say $\mathcal{U}'$ and $\mathcal{U}''$, defined over $\mathcal{N}'_{\alpha_c^\pm} \times X$ and $\mathcal{N}''_{\alpha_c^\pm} \times X$. These can be viewed as coherent sheaves of algebras (cf. [2]), or more precisely as examples of the Q-bundles considered in [20]. Pulling these back to $\mathcal{N}'_{\alpha_c^\pm} \times \mathcal{N}''_{\alpha_c^\pm} \times X$ we can construct $Hom(\mathcal{U}'', \mathcal{U}')$ (where we have abused notation for the sake of clarity). Taking the projection from $\mathcal{N}'_{\alpha_c^\pm} \times \mathcal{N}''_{\alpha_c^\pm} \times X$ onto $\mathcal{N}'_{\alpha_c^\pm} \times \mathcal{N}''_{\alpha_c^\pm}$, we can then construct the first direct image sheaf. By the results in [20], we can identify the fibers as hypercohomology groups which, in this case, parameterize extensions of triples. We thus obtain $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{\alpha_c^\pm}$ as the projectivization of the first direct image of $Hom(\mathcal{U}'',\mathcal{U}')$. If the coprime conditions fail, then the universal objects do not exist globally. However they still exist locally over (analytic) open sets in the stable locus in the base $\mathcal{N}'_{\alpha_c^\pm} \times \mathcal{N}''_{\alpha_c^\pm}$. This is sufficient for our purpose since by construction the image of the map in (6.7) lies in the stable locus. The result now follows from (6.8) and formula (5.16) (in Theorem 5.21) as applied to $\mathcal{N}'_{\alpha_c^\pm}$ and $\mathcal{N}''_{\alpha_c^\pm}$. $\square$

Corollary 6.10. *If $\alpha_c > 2g-2$ then the loci $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_c^\pm} \subset \mathcal{N}^s_{\alpha_c^\pm}$ are locally contained in subvarieties of codimension bounded below by*

$$\min\{-\chi(\mathbf{n}'',\mathbf{d}'',\mathbf{n}',\mathbf{d}')\}\ ,$$

where the minimum is over all $(\mathbf{n}',\mathbf{d}')$ and $(\mathbf{n}'',\mathbf{d}'')$ which satisfy (6.5) and (6.6) and also $\frac{n'_2}{n'_1+n'_2} < \frac{n''_2}{n''_1+n''_2}$ (in the case of $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_c^+}$) or $\frac{n'_2}{n'_1+n'_2} > \frac{n''_2}{n''_1+n''_2}$ (in the case of $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_c^-}$). The same is true for $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_c^+}$ when $\alpha_c = 2g-2$.

Proof. If $\alpha_c > 2g-2$ then we can assume $\alpha_c^\pm \geqslant 2g-2$. Clearly also, $\alpha_c^+ \geqslant 2g-2$ when $\alpha_c = 2g-2$. Thus by Theorem 5.21 the moduli spaces $\mathcal{N}^s_{\alpha^\pm}$ are smooth and have dimension $1-\chi(n_1,n_2,d_1,d_2)$. By Corollary 5.16 and Proposition 6.9 we get

$$\begin{aligned}\dim\mathcal{N}^s_{\alpha^\pm} = 1 &- \chi(n'_1,d'_1,n'_2,d'_2) - \chi(n''_1,d''_1,n''_2,d''_2)\\ &- \chi(n'_1,d'_1,n''_2,d''_2) - \chi(n''_1,d''_1,n'_2,d'_2)\\ =&\dim\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{\alpha_c^\pm}(\mathbf{n}'',\mathbf{d}'',\mathbf{n}',\mathbf{d}') - \chi(n''_1,d''_1,n'_2,d'_2).\end{aligned}$$

$\square$

In order to complete the estimate on the size of the flip loci we thus need to estimate the expressions $\chi(T'',T') = \chi(\mathbf{n}'',\mathbf{d}'',\mathbf{n}',\mathbf{d}')$. The basic idea is to identify $\chi(T',T'')$ as a hypercohomology Euler characteristic for the complex $C^\bullet(T'',T')$ defined in 5.12 and to notice that the complex is itself a holomorphic triple. As such it ought to satisfy a stability condition induced from the stability condition of T' and T''. The right way to obtain the stability condition for $C^\bullet(T'',T')$ should be via the Hitchin–Kobayashi correspondence, in a way analogous to the case of vector bundles: to show that the tensor product of two stable vector bundles is semistable, one constructs a flat unitary connection on the tensor product from flat unitary connections on each of the factors. In the case of holomorphic triples one considers solutions to the so-called coupled vortex equations instead of flat connections. However, it turns out that one cannot construct (at least in a simple way) a solution to the coupled vortex equations for $C^\bullet(T'', T')$ from solutions on T' and T''. Instead one needs to consider a so-called *holomorphic chain*. These objects were studied in [1] and generalize holomorphic triples. Next we recall the relevant results and definitions.

6.3 Holomorphic chains

A *holomorphic chain* is a diagram

$$\mathcal{C}\colon E_m \xrightarrow{\phi_m} E_{m-1} \xrightarrow{\phi_{m-1}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\phi_1} E_0,$$

where each E_i is a holomorphic bundle and $\phi_i\colon E_i \to E_{i-1}$ is a holomorphic map. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\mathcal{C}) &= \mu(E_0 \oplus \cdots \oplus E_m), \\ \lambda_i(\mathcal{C}) &= \frac{\operatorname{rk}(E_i)}{\sum_{i=0}^m \operatorname{rk}(E_i)}, \quad i = 0, \dots, m. \end{aligned}$$

For $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$, the $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$*-slope* of $\mathcal{C}$ is defined to be

$$\mu_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathcal{C}) = \mu(\mathcal{C}) + \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \lambda_i(\mathcal{C}).$$

The notions of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$-(semi)stability and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$-polystability are then defined via the standard $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$-slope condition on sub-chains. Note that holomorphic chains generalize holomorphic triples: a holomorphic triple is a holomorphic chain of length 2, and the stability notions coincide, taking $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha)$. There are natural gauge theoretic equations for holomorphic chains, which we now describe. Define $\boldsymbol{\tau} = (\tau_0, \dots, \tau_m) \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ by

$$\tau_i = \mu_\alpha(\mathcal{C}) - \alpha_i, \quad i = 0, \dots, m, \tag{6.9}$$

where we make the convention $\alpha_0 = 0$. Then $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ can be recovered from $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ by

$$\alpha_i = \tau_0 - \tau_i, \quad i = 0, \dots, m. \tag{6.10}$$

The $\boldsymbol{\tau}$*-vortex equations* or *chain vortex equations*

$$\sqrt{-1}\Lambda F(E_i) + \phi_{i+1}\phi_{i+1}^* - \phi_i^*\phi_i = \tau_i \operatorname{Id}_{E_i}, \quad i = 0, \dots, m,$$

are equations for Hermitian metrics on $E_0, \dots, E_m$. Here $F(E_i)$ is the curvature of the Hermitian connection on E_i, Λ is contraction with the Kähler form and $\operatorname{vol}(X) = 2\pi$. By convention $\phi_i = 0$ for $i \neq 1, \dots, m$. With these preliminaries we can now state the Hitchin–Kobayashi correspondence for holomorphic chains.

Theorem 6.11 ([1]). *A holomorphic chain $\mathcal{C}$ is $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$-polystable if and only if the $\boldsymbol{\tau}$-vortex equations have a solution, where $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ are related by* (6.9).

Remark 6.12. To be consistent with the previous notation for holomorphic triples we use here a slightly different notation from that of [1]: in that paper a parameter vector $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = (\tilde{\alpha}_0, \tilde{\alpha}_1, \dots, \tilde{\alpha}_m)$ is used; in these terms our $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is given by $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\tilde{\alpha}_0 - \tilde{\alpha}_1, \dots, \tilde{\alpha}_0 - \tilde{\alpha}_m)$.

Consider the length 3 holomorphic chain

$$\widetilde{C^{\bullet}}(T'', T')\colon E_1''^{*} \otimes E_2' \xrightarrow{a_2} E_1''^{*} \otimes E_1' \oplus E_2''^{*} \otimes E_2' \xrightarrow{a_1} E_2''^{*} \otimes E_1', \tag{6.11}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a_2(\psi) &= (\phi'\psi, -\psi\phi''), \\ a_1(\psi_1, \psi_2) &= \phi'\psi_2 - \psi_1\phi''. \end{aligned}$$

We shall sometimes write this chain briefly as

$$\widetilde{C^{\bullet}}(T'', T')\colon C_2 \xrightarrow{a_2} C_1 \xrightarrow{a_1} C_0.$$

Note that the last two terms of $\widetilde{C^{\bullet}}(T'', T')$ is just the complex $C^{\bullet}(T'', T')$. Note also that $\widetilde{C^{\bullet}}(T'', T')$ is not in general a complex. Our goal in this section is to prove, using the Hitchin–Kobayashi correspondence for chains, that if T' and T'' are α-polystable then $\widetilde{C^{\bullet}}(T'', T')$ is $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$-polystable for a suitable choice of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$.

Lemma 6.13. *Let T' and T'' be holomorphic triples and suppose we have solutions to the (τ_1', τ_2')-vortex equations on T' and the (τ_1'', τ_2'')-vortex equations on T'', such that $\tau_1' - \tau_1'' = \tau_2' - \tau_2''$. Then the induced Hermitian metric on $\widetilde{C^{\bullet}}(T'', T')$ satisfies the chain vortex equations*

$$\sqrt{-1}\Lambda F(C_0) + a_1 {a_1}^* = \tilde{\tau}_0 \operatorname{Id}_{C_0}, \tag{6.12}$$

$$\sqrt{-1}\Lambda F(C_1) + a_2 {a_2}^* - {a_1}^* a_1 = \tilde{\tau}_1 \operatorname{Id}_{C_1}, \tag{6.13}$$

$$\sqrt{-1}\Lambda F(C_2) - {a_2}^* a_2 = \tilde{\tau}_2 \operatorname{Id}_{C_2}. \tag{6.14}$$

for $\boldsymbol{\tau} = (\tilde{\tau}_0, \tilde{\tau}_1, \tilde{\tau}_2)$ given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\tau}_0 &= \tau_1' - \tau_2'', \\ \tilde{\tau}_1 &= \tau_1' - \tau_1'' = \tau_2' - \tau_2'', \\ \tilde{\tau}_2 &= \tau_2' - \tau_1''. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We shall only show that the induced Hermitian metric satisfies (6.13), since the proofs that it satisfies the two remaining equations are similar (but simpler).

The coupled vortex equations for T' and T'' are

$$\begin{aligned} &\sqrt{-1}\Lambda F(E_1') + \phi'\phi'^* = \tau_1' \operatorname{Id}_{E_1'}, && \sqrt{-1}\Lambda F(E_1'') + \phi''\phi''^* = \tau_1'' \operatorname{Id}_{E_1''}, \\ &\sqrt{-1}\Lambda F(E_2') - \phi'^*\phi' = \tau_2' \operatorname{Id}_{E_2'}, && \sqrt{-1}\Lambda F(E_2'') - \phi''^*\phi'' = \tau_2'' \operatorname{Id}_{E_2''}. \end{aligned}$$

We shall write the left hand side of (6.13) in terms of these known data of the triples T' and T''. First, we note that

$$F(E_i'^*) = -F(E_i')^t, \quad i = 1, 2,$$

and similarly for $F(E_i''^*)$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} F(C_1) &= F(E_1''^* \otimes E_1' \oplus E_2''^* \otimes E_2') \\ &= \big(F(E_1''^*) \otimes \operatorname{Id} + \operatorname{Id} \otimes F(E_1'),\ F(E_2''^*) \otimes \operatorname{Id} + \operatorname{Id} \otimes F(E_2')\big) \\ &= \big(-F(E_1'')^t \otimes \operatorname{Id} + \operatorname{Id} \otimes F(E_1'),\ -F(E_2'')^t \otimes \operatorname{Id} + \operatorname{Id} \otimes F(E_2')\big). \end{aligned} \tag{6.15}$$

Next we calculate a_1^*: note that for $\xi \otimes x \in C_0$ and $(\eta_1 \otimes y_1, \eta_2 \otimes y_2) \in C_1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\big\langle a_1^*(\xi \otimes x),\ (\eta_1 \otimes y_1, \eta_2 \otimes y_2)\big\rangle_{C_1} \\ =&\big\langle \xi \otimes x,\ a_1(\eta_1 \otimes y_1, \eta_2 \otimes y_2)\big\rangle_{C_0} \\ =&\big\langle \xi \otimes x,\ -\eta_1\phi'' \otimes y_1 + \eta_2 \otimes \phi'(y_2)\big\rangle_{C_0} \\ =&\big\langle \xi \otimes x,\ -\phi''^t(\eta_1) \otimes y_1 + \eta_2 \otimes \phi'(y_2)\big\rangle_{C_0} \\ =&-\big\langle \xi, \phi''^t(\eta_1)\big\rangle_{E_2''^*} \big\langle x, y_1\big\rangle_{E_1'} + \big\langle \xi, \eta_2\big\rangle_{E_2''^*} \big\langle x, \phi'(y_2)\big\rangle_{E_1'} \\ =&-\big\langle \phi''^{t*}(\xi), \eta_1\big\rangle_{E_1''^*} \big\langle x, y_1\big\rangle_{E_1'} + \big\langle \xi, \eta_2\big\rangle_{E_2''^*} \big\langle \phi'^*(x), y_2\big\rangle_{E_2'} \\ =&\big\langle (-\phi''^{t*}(\xi) \otimes x, \xi \otimes \phi'^*(x)),\ (\eta_1 \otimes y_1, \eta_2 \otimes y_2)\big\rangle_{C_1}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$a_1^*(\xi \otimes x) = \big(-\phi''^{t*}(\xi) \otimes x,\ \xi \otimes \phi'^*(x)\big). \tag{6.16}$$

Similarly, to calculate a_2^* consider $\xi \otimes x \in C_2$ and $(\eta_1 \otimes y_1, \eta_2 \otimes y_2) \in C_1$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\big\langle a_2^*(\eta_1 \otimes y_1, \eta_2 \otimes y_2),\ \xi \otimes x \big\rangle_{C_2} \\
=&\big\langle (\eta_1 \otimes y_1, \eta_2 \otimes y_2),\ a_2(\xi \otimes x) \big\rangle_{C_1} \\
=&\big\langle (\eta_1 \otimes y_1, \eta_2 \otimes y_2),\ (\xi \otimes \phi'(x), -\xi\phi'' \otimes x) \big\rangle_{C_1} \\
=&\big\langle \eta_1 \otimes y_1, \xi \otimes \phi'(x) \big\rangle_{E_1''^* \otimes E_1'} \ +\ \big\langle \eta_2 \otimes y_2, -\phi''^t(\xi) \otimes x \big\rangle_{E_2''^* \otimes E_2'} \\
=&\big\langle \eta_1 \otimes \phi'^*(y_1), \xi \otimes x \big\rangle_{E_1''^* \otimes E_2'} \ +\ \big\langle -\phi''^{t*}(\eta_2) \otimes y_2, \xi \otimes x \big\rangle_{E_1''^* \otimes E_2'}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$a_2^*(\eta_1 \otimes y_1, \eta_2 \otimes y_2) = \eta_1 \otimes \phi'^*(y_1) - \phi''^{t*}(\eta_2) \otimes y_2. \tag{6.17}$$

Using (6.17) and (6.16) we can now calculate for $(\eta_1 \otimes y_1, \eta_2 \otimes y_2) \in C_1$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&a_2 a_2^*(\eta_1 \otimes y_1, \eta_2 \otimes y_2) \\
&= \big(\eta_1 \otimes \phi'\phi'^*(y_1) - \phi''^{t*}(\eta_2) \otimes \phi'(y_2),\ -\phi''^t(\eta_1) \otimes \phi'^*(y_1) + \phi''^t\phi''^{t*}(\eta_2) \otimes y_2\big),
\end{aligned} \tag{6.18}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&a_1^* a_1(\eta_1 \otimes y_1, \eta_2 \otimes y_2) \\
&= \big(\phi''^{t*}\phi''^t(\eta_1) \otimes y_1 - \phi''^{t*}(\eta_2) \otimes \phi'(y_2),\ -\phi''^t(\eta_1) \otimes \phi'^*(y_1) + \eta_2 \otimes \phi'^*\phi'(y_2)\big).
\end{aligned} \tag{6.19}$$

Putting together (6.15), (6.18) and (6.19) we finally obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\big(\sqrt{-1}\Lambda F(C_1) + a_2 {a_2}^* - {a_1}^* a_1\big)(\eta_1 \otimes y_1, \eta_2 \otimes y_2) \\
&= \Big(\eta_1 \otimes \big(\sqrt{-1}\Lambda F(E_1') + \phi'\phi'^*\big)(y_1) + \big(-\sqrt{-1}\Lambda F(E_1'')^t + \phi''^{t*}\phi''^t\big)(\eta_1) \otimes y_1, \\
&\qquad \eta_2 \otimes \big(\sqrt{-1}\Lambda F(E_2') - \phi'^*\phi'\big)(y_2) - \big(\sqrt{-1}\Lambda F(E_2'')^t - \phi''^t\phi''^{t*}\big)(\eta_2) \otimes y_2\Big).
\end{aligned} \tag{6.20}$$

Notice that the unpleasant mixed term $\big(-\phi''^{t*}(\eta_2) \otimes \phi'(y_2), -\phi''^t(\eta_1) \otimes \phi'^*(y_1)\big)$ appears both in $a_1^* a_1$ and $a_2 a_2^*$ and therefore cancels. This would not have been the case if we had considered the vortex equations on the triple $C^\bullet(T'', T')$ and is the reason why we must consider the chain $\widetilde{C^\bullet}(T'', T')$. Combining (6.20) with the coupled vortex equations (or their transposes) for the triples T' and T'' we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\big(\sqrt{-1}\Lambda F(C_1) + a_2 {a_2}^* - {a_1}^* a_1\big)(\eta_1 \otimes y_1, \eta_2 \otimes y_2) \\
&\qquad\qquad = \big((\tau_1' - \tau_1'')\eta_1 \otimes y_1, (\tau_2' - \tau_2'')\eta_2 \otimes y_2\big).
\end{aligned} \tag{6.21}$$

Since $\tau_1' - \tau_1'' = \tau_2' - \tau_2''$ this concludes the proof. □

Proposition 6.14. *Let T' and T'' be α-polystable triples. Then the holomorphic chain $\widetilde{C^\bullet}(T'', T')$ is $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$-polystable for $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = (\alpha, 2\alpha)$.*

Proof. Since T' and T'' are α-polystable, it follows from the Hitchin–Kobayashi correspondence for triples that they support solutions to the (τ_1', τ_2')- and (τ_1', τ_2')-vortex equations, respectively, where $\alpha = \tau_1' - \tau_2' = \tau_1'' - \tau_2''$. Notice that $\tau_1' - \tau_1'' = \tau_2' - \tau_2''$. Thus Lemma 6.13 shows that $\widetilde{C^\bullet}(T'', T')$ supports a solutions to the chain vortex equations for $\boldsymbol{\tau} = (\tau_1' - \tau_2'', \tau_1' - \tau_1'', \tau_2' - \tau_1'')$. Now the Hitchin–Kobayashi correspondence for chains (Theorem 6.11) and (6.10) imply that $\widetilde{C^\bullet}(T'', T')$ is $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$-polystable for

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_1 &= \tau_1' - \tau_2'' - \tau_2' + \tau_2'' = \alpha, \\
\alpha_2 &= \tau_1' - \tau_2'' - \tau_2' + \tau_1'' = 2\alpha.
\end{aligned}$$

□

The following Lemmas will be needed in the next section:

Lemma 6.15. *Let $T' = (E_1', E_2', \phi')$ and $T'' = (E_1'', E_2'', \phi'')$ be triples for which the chain $\widetilde{C^\bullet}(T'', T')$ is $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha, 2\alpha)$-poly-stable. Let*

$$\begin{aligned}
C_1 &= E_1''^* \otimes E_1' \oplus E_2''^* \otimes E_2', \\
C_0 &= E_2''^* \otimes E_1',
\end{aligned}$$

and $a_1 \colon C_1 \to C_0$ be defined as in (6.11). Then the following inequalities hold.

$$\deg(\ker(a_1)) \leqslant \operatorname{rk}(\ker(a_1))(\mu_\alpha(T') - \mu_\alpha(T'')), \tag{6.22}$$

$$\deg(\operatorname{im}(a_1)) \leqslant \big(\operatorname{rk}(C_0) - \operatorname{rk}(\operatorname{im}(a_1))\big)(\mu_\alpha(T'') - \mu_\alpha(T') - \alpha) + \deg(C_0). \tag{6.23}$$

Proof. If $\operatorname{rk}(\ker(a_1)) = 0$ then (6.22) is obvious. Assume therefore that $\operatorname{rk}(\ker(a_1) > 0$. Using $\ker(a_1)$, we can then define a quotient of the chain $\widetilde{C^\bullet}(T'', T')$ by

$$\mathcal{K} \colon 0 \to \ker(a_1) \to 0.$$

Thus, since $\mu_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathcal{K}) = \mu(\ker(a_1)) + \alpha$, it follows that

$$\mu(\ker(a_1)) + \alpha \leqslant \mu_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\widetilde{C^\bullet}(T'', T')) = \mu_\alpha(T') - \mu_\alpha(T'') + \alpha.$$

We therefore have

$$\mu(\ker(a_1)) \leqslant \mu_\alpha(T') - \mu_\alpha(T''),$$

which is equivalent to (6.22). The second inequality, i.e. (6.23), is obvious if $\mathrm{rk}(\mathrm{im}(a_1) = \mathrm{rk}(C_0)$. We thus assume $\mathrm{rk}(\mathrm{im}(a_1) < \mathrm{rk}(C_0)$. Using the cokernel $\mathrm{coker}(a_1)$ (or its saturation if it is not torsion free), we can define a sub-chain of the chain $\widetilde{C^\bullet}(T'', T')$ by

$$\mathcal{Q}\colon 0 \to 0 \to \mathrm{coker}(a_1).$$

By the $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$-poly-stability of $\widetilde{C^\bullet}(T'', T')$ we have $\mu_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathcal{Q}) \geqslant \mu_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\widetilde{C^\bullet}(T'', T'))$. This, together with the fact that

$$\mu(\mathrm{coker}(a_1) \leqslant \frac{\deg(C_0) - \deg(\mathrm{im}(a_1))}{\mathrm{rk}(C_0) - \mathrm{rk}(\mathrm{im}(a_1))} \ ,$$

leads directly to 6.23. □

Lemma 6.16. *Let*

$$0 \longrightarrow T' \longrightarrow T \longrightarrow T'' \longrightarrow 0$$

be an extension of α*-polystable triples, where* T' *and* T'' *are non-zero and* $\mu_\alpha(T') = \mu_\alpha(T'') = \mu_\alpha(T)$. *Let* α_m *and* α_M *be the extreme* α *values for the triple* T*, as defined in (5.3) and (5.4), with the convention that* $\alpha_M = \infty$ *if* $n_1 = n_2$ *in* T*. Then the map*

$$a_1\colon E_1''^* \otimes E_1' \oplus E_2''^* \otimes E_2' \to E_2''^* \otimes E_1'$$

is not an isomorphism if $\alpha_m < \alpha < \alpha_M$.

Proof. If a_1 is an isomorphism then, applying Lemma 4.12 fibrewise, it follows that one of the following alternatives must occur:

(a) $E_1' = E_2'' = 0$ and $\phi' = \phi'' = 0$.

(b) $E_1'' = 0$, $E_1', E_2', E_2'' \neq 0$ and $\phi'\colon E_2' \xrightarrow{\cong} E_1'$.

(c) $E_2' = 0$, $E_1', E_1'', E_2'' \neq 0$ and $\phi''\colon E_2'' \xrightarrow{\cong} E_1''$.

We shall consider each case in turn. *Case (a).* In this case $T' = (0, E_2, 0)$, $T'' = (E_1, 0, 0)$, $T = (E_1, E_2, 0)$, and the extension $0 \to T' \to T \to T'' \to 0$ is trivial. It follows from $\mu_\alpha(T') = \mu_\alpha(T)$ that $\alpha = \mu(E_1) - \mu(E_2) = \alpha_m$. *Case (b).* In this case we have $n_1 = n_1'$ and $n_2 = n_2' + n_2'' = n_1' + n_2''$. Hence $n_2 > n_1$. Furthermore, from $\mu_\alpha(T') = \mu_\alpha(T)$ we get $\mu(E_1) + \frac{\alpha}{2} = \mu(E_1 \oplus E_2) + \frac{n_2}{n_1+n_2}$, i.e. $\alpha = \frac{2n_2}{n_2 - n_1}\alpha_m = \alpha_M$. *Case (c).* In this case we have $n_2 = n_2''$ and

$n_1 = n_1' + n_1'' = n_1' + n_2''$. Hence $n_1 > n_2$. Furthermore, from $\mu_\alpha(T'') = \mu_\alpha(T)$ we get $\alpha = \frac{2n_1}{n_1 - n_2}\alpha_m = \alpha_M$. If $n_1 = n_2$ then case (a) is the only possibility, so $\alpha = \alpha_m$. If $n_1 \neq n_2$, then (a) or exactly one of (b) and (c) are the only possibilities, depending on whether $n_1 < n_2$ or $n_1 > n_2$. In both cases we see that $\alpha = \alpha_m$ or $\alpha = \alpha_M$. □

6.4 Estimate of $\chi(\mathbf{n}'', \mathbf{d}'', \mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}')$ and comparison of moduli spaces

Let $\alpha_c \in (\alpha_m, \alpha_M)$ be a critical value with $\alpha_c \geqslant 2g - 2$, and let $\alpha_c^\pm$ be as in (6.2). Fix $(\mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}') = (n_1', n_2', d_1', d_2')$ and $(\mathbf{n}'', \mathbf{d}'') = (n_1'', n_2'', d_1'', d_2'')$ such that equations (6.5) and (6.6) are satisfied, and such that $\frac{n_2'}{n_1'+n_2'} \neq \frac{n_2''}{n_1''+n_2''}$. Let T' and T'' be triples of type $(\mathbf{n}', \mathbf{d}') = (n_1', n_2', d_1', d_2')$ and $(\mathbf{n}'', \mathbf{d}'') = (n_1'', n_2'', d_1'', d_2'')$ respectively. Suppose that T' and T'' satisfy:

- both are α_c-semistable with $\mu_{\alpha_c}(T') = \mu_{\alpha_c}(T'')$,
- if $\frac{n_2'}{n_1'+n_2'} < \frac{n_2''}{n_1''+n_2''}$ then T' and T'' are both α_c^+-stable,
- if $\frac{n_2'}{n_1'+n_2'} > \frac{n_2''}{n_1''+n_2''}$ then T' and T'' are both α_c^--stable.

It follows by Proposition 6.14 that the chain $\widetilde{C^\bullet}(T'', T')$ is $(\alpha_c^+, 2\alpha_c^+)$-polystable (if $\frac{n_2'}{n_1'+n_2'} < \frac{n_2''}{n_1''+n_2''}$) or it is $(\alpha_c^-, 2\alpha_c^-)$-polystable (if $\frac{n_2'}{n_1'+n_2'} < \frac{n_2''}{n_1''+n_2''}$).

Lemma 6.17. *The chain $\widetilde{C^\bullet}(T'', T')$ is $(\alpha_c, 2\alpha_c)$ polystable.*

Proof. The critical values for the chain form a discrete set of points in the (α_1, α_2) plane. We can thus pick $\epsilon > 0$ so that, with $\alpha_c^\pm = \alpha_c \pm \epsilon$, the point $(\alpha_c^\pm, 2\alpha_c^\pm)$ is not a critical point. We can in fact assume that there are no critical points in $B_\epsilon^\circ(\alpha_c, 2\alpha_c)$, i.e. in the punctured ball of radius ϵ centered at $(\alpha_c, 2\alpha_c)$. Thus $(\alpha_c^\pm, 2\alpha_c^\pm)$ polystability is equivalent to $(\alpha_c, 2\alpha_c)$ polystability. □

Proposition 6.18. *Let $T' = (E_1', E_2', \phi')$ and $T'' = (E_1'', E_2'', \phi'')$ be triples as above. In particular, suppose that both are α_c-semstable and that $\mu_{\alpha_c}(T') = \mu_{\alpha_c}(T'')$. Then*

$$\chi(T'', T') \leqslant 1 - g < 0$$

if one of the following holds:

1. $\alpha_c > 2g-2$ *and* T'*,* T'' *are both are* α_c^-*-stable,*

2. $\alpha_c \geqslant 2g-2$ *and* T'*,* T'' *are both are* α_c^+*-stable.*

Proof. From the long exact sequence (5.13) and the Riemann-Roch formula we obtain

$$\chi(T'',T') = (1-g)\big(\mathrm{rk}(C_1) - \mathrm{rk}(C_0)\big) + \deg(C_1) - \deg(C_0). \tag{6.24}$$

where C_1 and C_0 are as in (6.11). From Proposition 6.14, we know that $\widetilde{C^\bullet}(T'',T')$ is $(\alpha_c^+, 2\alpha_c^+)$-poly-stable or $(\alpha_c^-, 2\alpha_c^-)$-poly-stable. By the Lemma 6.17 it follows that $\widetilde{C^\bullet}(T'',T')$ is also $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_c, 2\alpha_c)$-poly-stable. Thus Lemma 6.15 applies, and we can use the estimates (6.22) and (6.23). Together with

$$\deg(C_1) = \deg(\ker(a_1)) + \deg(\mathrm{im}(a_1)) \ , \tag{6.25}$$

$$\mathrm{rk}(C_1) = \mathrm{rk}(\ker(a_1)) + \mathrm{rk}(\mathrm{im}(a_1)) \ , \tag{6.26}$$

these yield

$$\begin{aligned}\deg(C_1) \leqslant (\mu_{\alpha_c}(T') - \mu_{\alpha_c}(T''))\big(\mathrm{rk}(C_1) - \mathrm{rk}(C_0)\big) \\ - \alpha_c\big(\mathrm{rk}(C_0) - \mathrm{rk}(\mathrm{im}(a_1))\big) + \deg(C_0).\end{aligned}$$

Using that $\mu_{\alpha_c}(T') = \mu_{\alpha_c}(T'')$, we can then deduce that

$$\deg(C_1) - \deg(C_0) \leqslant -\alpha_c\big(\mathrm{rk}(C_0) - \mathrm{rk}(\mathrm{im}(a_1))\big).$$

Combining this with (6.24) we get

$$\chi(T'',T') \leqslant (1-g)\big(\mathrm{rk}(C_1) - \mathrm{rk}(C_0)\big) - \alpha_c\big(\mathrm{rk}(C_0) - \mathrm{rk}(\mathrm{im}(a_1))\big) \ . \tag{6.27}$$

If $\alpha_c \geqslant 2g-2$ then we get

$$\chi(T'',T') \leqslant (1-g)\big(\mathrm{rk}(C_0) + \mathrm{rk}(C_1) - 2\,\mathrm{rk}(\mathrm{im}(a_1))\big),$$

with equality if and only if $\alpha_c = 2g-2$. Furthermore $\mathrm{rk}(a_1) \leqslant \mathrm{rk}(C_0)$ and $\mathrm{rk}(a_1) \leqslant \mathrm{rk}(C_1)$, with equality in both if and only if a_1 is an isomorphism. Thus in all cases we get $\chi(T'',T') \leqslant 0$, with equality if and only if $\alpha_c = 2g-2$ and a_1 is an isomorphism. But by Lemma 6.16 if $\alpha_m < \alpha_c < \alpha_M$ then a_1 cannot be an isomorphism. Thus in all cases we get $\mathrm{rk}(C_0) + \mathrm{rk}(C_1) - 2\,\mathrm{rk}(\mathrm{im}(a_1) \geqslant 1)$ and hence $\chi(T'',T') \leqslant 1-g$. □

Combining Proposition 6.18 with Corollary 6.10, we obtain

Theorem 6.19. *Let* $\alpha_c \in (\alpha_m, \alpha_M)$ *be a critical value for triples of type* $(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d})$*. If* $\alpha_c > 2g-2$ *then the loci* $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_c^\pm} \subset \mathcal{N}^s_{\alpha_c^\pm}$ *are contained in subvarieties of codimension at least* $g-1$*. In particular, they are contained in subvarieties of strictly positive codimension if* $g \geqslant 2$*. If* $\alpha_c = 2g-2$ *then the same is true for* $\mathcal{S}_{\alpha_c^+}$*.*

Corollary 6.20. *Let* α_1 *and* α_2 *be any two values in* (α_m, α_M) *such that* $\alpha_m < \alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \alpha_M$ *and* $2g-2 \leqslant \alpha_1$*. Then*

- *The moduli spaces* $\mathcal{N}^s_{\alpha_1}$ *and* $\mathcal{N}^s_{\alpha_2}$ *have the same number of connected components, and*
- *The moduli space* $\mathcal{N}^s_{\alpha_1}$ *is irreducible if and only if* $\mathcal{N}^s_{\alpha_2}$ *is.*

Proof. This follows immediately from Theorem 6.19 if α_1 and α_2 are non-critical, and from Theorem 6.19 together with Lemma 6.3 if either of them is critical. □

7 Special values of α

Throughout this section we will assume that the triple (E_1, E_2, ϕ) has type (n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2), with $n_1 \geqslant n_2$. The case $n_1 < n_2$ can be dealt with via duality of triples. In this section we identify some critical values in the range (α_m, α_M) and describe their significance for the structure of α-stable triples.

7.1 The kernel of ϕ and the parameter α

Definition 7.1. *For each integer* $0 \leqslant j < n_2$ *set*

$$\alpha_j = \frac{2n_1n_2}{n_2(n_1-n_2)+(j+1)(n_1+n_2)}(\mu_1-\mu_2)\ . \tag{7.1}$$

Proposition 7.2. *Let* $T = (E_1, E_2, \phi)$ *be a triple in which* $n_1 \geqslant n_2$*. Let* $N \subset E_2$ *be the kernel of* $\phi : E_2 \longrightarrow E_1$*. Suppose that* T *is* α*-semistable for some* $\alpha > \alpha_j$*. Then* N *has rank at most* j*. In particular, if* T *is* α*-semistable for some* $\alpha > \alpha_0$ *then* $N = 0$*, i.e.* ϕ *is injective.*

Proof. Suppose that

$$\mathrm{rk}(N) = k > 0\ . \tag{7.2}$$

We consider the subtriples $T_N = (0, N, 0)$ and $T_I = (I, E_2, \phi)$, where I denotes the image sheaf $\mathrm{im}(\phi)$. If $N \neq 0$, then the triple T_N is a proper subtriple, and so is T_I since $n_1 \geqslant n_2$. The α-semistability condition applied to T_N yields

$$\mu_N + \alpha \leqslant \mu + \frac{\alpha n_2}{n_1 + n_2} \ ,$$

where μ_N denotes the slope of N and μ is the slope of $E_1 \oplus E_2$. Rearranging, we get

$$\alpha n_1 \leqslant (n_1 + n_2)(\mu - \mu_N) \ . \tag{7.3}$$

The α-semistability condition applied to T_I yields

$$\mu(E_2 \oplus I) + \alpha \frac{n_2}{i + n_2} \leqslant \mu + \alpha \frac{n_2}{n_1 + n_2} \ , \tag{7.4}$$

where $i = \mathrm{rk}(I)$. Furthermore, from the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow N \longrightarrow E_2 \to I \longrightarrow 0 \ , \tag{7.5}$$

we get

$$k + i = n_2 \ , \tag{7.6}$$

$$k\mu_N + i\mu_I = n_2\mu_2 \ . \tag{7.7}$$

Using (7.7) we can write

$$\mu(E_2 \oplus I) = \frac{2n_2\mu_2 - k\mu_N}{2n_2 - k} \tag{7.8}$$

and hence (7.4) yields

$$-k(n_1 + n_2)\mu_N \leqslant (n_1 + n_2)((2n_2 - k)\mu - 2n_2\mu_2) + \alpha n_2(n_2 - k - n_1) \ . \tag{7.9}$$

Combining k times (7.3) and (7.9) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &\leqslant \frac{2n_2(n_1 + n_2)}{n_2(n_1 - n_2) + k(n_1 + n_2)}(\mu - \mu_2) \\ &= \frac{2n_1 n_2}{n_2(n_1 - n_2) + k(n_1 + n_2)}(\mu_1 - \mu_2). \end{aligned} \tag{7.10}$$

We have thus shown that if $\mathrm{rk}(N) = k$ and the triple is α-stable, then

$$\alpha \leqslant \alpha_{k-1}$$

where α_{k-1} is given by (7.1) with $j = k-1$. Equivalently, if the triple is α-semistable for some $\alpha > \alpha_{k-1}$, then $\mathrm{rk}(N) \neq k$. But

$$\alpha_{k-1} > \alpha_k > \cdots > \alpha_{n_2-1} \ .$$

We can thus conclude that if the triple is α-semistable with $\alpha > \alpha_{k-1}$, then the rank of N is strictly less than k. In particular, if $\alpha > \alpha_0$, where

$$\alpha_0 = \frac{2n_1n_2}{n_2(n_1-n_2)+(n_1+n_2)}(\mu_1-\mu_2), \tag{7.11}$$

then T is injective. □

We thus have the following.

Corollary 7.3. *Let $\alpha > \alpha_0$, where α_0 is given by (7.11).*

(1) An α-semistable triple (E_1, E_2, ϕ) defines a sequence of the form

$$0 \longrightarrow E_2 \xrightarrow{\phi} E_1 \longrightarrow F \oplus S \longrightarrow 0 \ , \tag{7.12}$$

where F is locally free and S is a torsion sheaf.

(2) If $n_1 = n_2$ then an α-semistable triple (E_1, E_2, ϕ) defines a sequence of the form

$$0 \longrightarrow E_2 \xrightarrow{\phi} E_1 \longrightarrow S \longrightarrow 0, \tag{7.13}$$

where S is a torsion sheaf of degree $d_1 - d_2$.

Lemma 7.4. *Let α_0 be given by (7.11).*

(1) If $n_1 > n_2$ then

$$\alpha_0 = \frac{n_2(n_1-n_2)}{n_2(n_1-n_2)+n_1+n_2}\alpha_M = \frac{2n_1n_2}{n_2(n_1-n_2)+n_1+n_2}\alpha_m, \tag{7.14}$$

where α_m and α_M are given by (5.3) and (5.4), respectively.

(2) If $n_1 = n_2 = n$ then

$$\alpha_0 = n\alpha_m = n(\mu_1 - \mu_2) = d_1 - d_2. \tag{7.15}$$

(3) If $n_1 \geqslant n_2$ then $\alpha_0 \geqslant \alpha_m$, with equality if and only if $\alpha_m = 0$ or $n_2 = 1$.

Proof. Parts (1) and (2) are immediate. Using (1) we compute

$$\alpha_0 - \alpha_m = \frac{n_1+n_2}{n_2(n_1-n_2)+n_1+n_2}(n_2-1)\alpha_m \ ,$$

from which (3) follows. □

7.2 The cokernel of ϕ and the parameter α

In this section we will assume that $n_1 > n_2$. The range for α is then $[\alpha_m, \alpha_M]$, where α_m and α_M are given by (5.3) and (5.3). Let us define

$$\alpha_t := \alpha_M - \frac{n_1+n_2}{n_2(n_1-n_2)}. \tag{7.16}$$

Proposition 7.5. *Suppose that a triple $T = (E_1, E_2, \phi)$ of the form (7.12) with $n_1 > n_2$ is α-semistable for some $\alpha > \alpha_m$. Then*

$$s \leqslant \frac{n_2(n_1-n_2)}{(n_1+n_2)}(\alpha_M - \alpha)\ ,$$

where s is the degree of S. In particular, if $\alpha > \alpha_t$, then $S = 0$.

Proof. If $T = (E_1, E_2, \phi)$ is of the form in (7.12), with $S \neq 0$, then we can find a proper subtriple $T' = (E_1', E_2, \phi)$ of the form

$$0 \longrightarrow E_2 \xrightarrow{\phi} E_1' \longrightarrow S \longrightarrow 0\ , \tag{7.17}$$

Indeed, E_1' is the kernel of the sheaf map $E_1 \longrightarrow F \oplus S \longrightarrow S$. Notice that $n_1' = n_2$ and $d_1' = d_2 + s$, where n_1' , d_1' denote the rank and degree of E_1', etc. We compute

$$\Delta_\alpha(T') = \frac{n_1}{n_1+n_2}(\mu_2 - \mu_1) + \frac{\alpha}{2}\left(\frac{n_1-n_2}{n_1+n_2}\right) + \frac{s}{2n_2}\ . \tag{7.18}$$

But

$$\frac{n_1}{n_1+n_2}(\mu_1 - \mu_2) = \frac{\alpha_M}{2}\left(\frac{n_1-n_2}{n_1+n_2}\right)$$

and hence

$$\Delta_\alpha(T') = \frac{n_1-n_2}{2(n_1+n_2)}\left(\alpha - \alpha_M + \frac{n_1+n_2}{n_2(n_1-n_2)}s\right). \tag{7.19}$$

If the triple is α-semistable then $\Delta_\alpha(T') \leqslant 0$ and the result follows. ☐

Let us define

$$\alpha_e = \max\{\alpha_m, \alpha_0, \alpha_t\}. \tag{7.20}$$

The following is then immediate.

Proposition 7.6. *Let $\alpha > \alpha_e$. An α-semistable triple (E_1, E_2, ϕ) defines an extension*

$$0 \longrightarrow E_2 \xrightarrow{\phi} E_1 \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow 0, \tag{7.21}$$

with F locally free.

It turns out that for extension like (7.21), arising from semistable triples the dimension of $H^1(E_2 \otimes F^*)$ does not depend on the given triple. More precisely:

Proposition 7.7. *Let (E_1, E_2, ϕ) be an α-semistable triple defining an extension like (7.21). Then $H^0(E_2 \otimes F^*) = 0$ and hence*

$$\dim H^1(E_2 \otimes F^*) = n_2 d_1 - n_1 d_2 + n_1(n_1 - n_2)(g-1). \tag{7.22}$$

Proof. From [6, Lemma 4.5] we have that the α-semistability of (E_1, E_2, ϕ) for arbitrary α implies that $H^0(E_1 \otimes E_2^*) = 0$. From (7.21), we have an injective homomorphism $F^* \to E_1^*$, which after tensoring with E_2 gives that $H^0(E_2 \otimes F^*)$ injects in $H^0(E_1 \otimes E_2^*)$, and hence the desired vanishing. By Riemann–Roch we obtain (7.22). □

8 Moduli space of triples with $n_1 \neq n_2$

Throughout this section we assume that $n_1 > n_2$. As usual, the case $n_1 < n_2$ can be dealt with by triples duality. Recall that the allowed range for the stability parameter is $\alpha_m \leqslant \alpha \leqslant \alpha_M$, where $\alpha_m = \mu_1 - \mu_2$ and $\alpha_M = \frac{2n_1}{n_1 - n_2}\alpha_m$, and we assume that $\mu_1 - \mu_2 > 0$.

We are now ready to jump all the way up to the large extreme value of the range, and describe the moduli space for α_M.

8.1 Moduli space for $\alpha = \alpha_M$

Proposition 8.1. *Let $T = (E_1, E_2, \phi)$ be an α_M-polystable triple then $E_1 = \operatorname{im}\phi \oplus F$, and T decomposes as the direct sum of two α_M-polystable triples of the same α_M-slope, T' and T'', where $T' = (\operatorname{im}\phi, E_2, \phi)$, and $T'' = (F, 0, 0)$. In particular, T is never α_M-stable. Moreover, $E_2 \cong \operatorname{im}\phi$ and E_2 and F are polystable.*

Proof. By Proposition, 7.6 T defines an extension

$$0 \longrightarrow E_2 \xrightarrow{\phi} E_1 \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow 0, \tag{8.1}$$

with F locally free. Let $T' = (\operatorname{im}\phi, E_2, \phi)$. Of course $\phi : E_2 \to \operatorname{im}\phi$ is an isomorphism, and

$$\mu_{\alpha_M}(T') = \mu(E_2) + \frac{\alpha_M}{2},$$

but this is equal to $\mu_{\alpha_M}(T)$ and hence T cannot be α_M-stable and must decompose as $T' \oplus T''$, where $T'' = (F, 0, 0)$. It is clear from the polystability of T that T' and T'' are α_M-polystable with the same α_M-slope. Applying the α_M-semistability condition to the subtriples $(E_2', \phi(E_2'), \phi) \subset T'$ and $(F', 0, 0) \subset T''$, we obtain that $\mu(E_2') \leqslant \mu(E_2)$ and $\mu(F') \leqslant \mu(F)$, and hence E_2 and F are semistable. In fact the polystability of T' and T'' imply the polystability of E_2 and F. ☐

Using Proposition 9.1 and Corollary 9.2 from Section 9.1, we obtain the following corollary of Proposition 8.1:

Corollary 8.2. *Suppose that $n_1 > n_2$ and $\mu_1 - \mu_2 > 0$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}_{\alpha_M}(n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2) &\cong \mathcal{N}_{\alpha_M}(n_2, n_2, d_2, d_2) \times M(n_1 - n_2, d_1 - d_2) \\ &\cong M(n_2, d_2) \times M(n_1 - n_2, d_1 - d_2) \end{aligned} \tag{8.2}$$

where $M(n, d)$ denotes the moduli space of polystable bundles of rank n and degree d. In particular, $\mathcal{N}_{\alpha_M}(n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2)$ is irreducible.

8.2 Moduli space for large α

Let α_L be the largest critical value in (α_m, α_M), and let $\mathcal{N}_L$ (respectively $\mathcal{N}_L^s$) denote the moduli space of α-polystable (respectively α-stable) triples for $\alpha_L < \alpha < \alpha_M$. We refer to $\mathcal{N}_L$ as the 'large α' moduli space.

If a triple $T = (E_1, E_2, \phi)$ defines an extension of the form (7.21), then $I = \operatorname{im}\phi$ is a subbundle with torsion free quotient in E_1, and $\phi : E_2 \longrightarrow I$ is an isomorphism. Thus we get a subtriple $T_I = (I, E_2, \phi)$ in which the bundles have the same rank and degree, and ϕ is an isomorphism.

Proposition 8.3. *Let $T = (E_1, E_2, \phi)$ represent a point in $\mathcal{N}_L$, i.e. suppose that the triple is α-semistable for some α in the range $\alpha_L < \alpha < \alpha_M$. Then*

(1) *the triple $T_I = (I, E_2, \phi)$ is α_M-semistable*

(2) *the bundle E_2 is semistable*

Proof. (1). Let $T' = (E_1', E_2', \phi')$ be any subtriple of T_I. Since T' is also a subtriple of T, we get

$$\mu_\alpha(T') \leqslant \mu_\alpha(T) \ . \tag{8.3}$$

A direct computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_\alpha(T) &= \mu_\alpha(T_I) + \frac{n_1 - n_2}{n_1 + n_2}(\mu(F) - \mu_2 - \frac{\alpha}{2}) \\ &= \mu_\alpha(T_I) + \frac{n_1 - n_2}{2(n_1 + n_2)}(\alpha_M - \alpha), \end{aligned} \tag{8.4}$$

where in the last line we have used the fact that $n_1 > n_2$ in T and hence $\alpha_M = \frac{2n_1}{n_1 - n_2}(\mu_1 - \mu_2) = 2(\mu(F) - \mu_2)$. Thus for all $\alpha_L < \alpha < \alpha_M$ we have

$$\mu_\alpha(T') - \mu_\alpha(T_I) \leqslant \frac{n_1 - n_2}{2(n_1 + n_2)}(\alpha_M - \alpha) \ .$$

Taking the limit $\alpha \to \alpha_M$, we get

$$\mu_{\alpha_M}(T') - \mu_{\alpha_M}(T_I) \leqslant 0 \ ,$$

i.e. T_I is α_M-semistable.

(2). Let $E_2' \subset E_2$ be any proper subsheaf. Then $(\phi(E_2'), E_2', \phi)$ is a subtriple of T_I. Since $\phi : E_2 \longrightarrow \phi(E_2)$ is an isomorphism, this subtriple has $\mu(\phi(E_2') = \mu(E_2')$ and $n_2' = n_1'$. The α_M-semistability condition of T_I thus gives

$$\mu(E_2') + \frac{\alpha_M}{2} \leqslant \mu_2 + \frac{\alpha_M}{2} \ ,$$

(where we have made use of the fact that $\mu(\phi(E_2) = \mu(E_2) = \mu_2)$. It follows from this that $\mu(E_2') \leqslant \mu_2$, i.e. that E_2 is semistable. ☐

Proposition 8.4. *Suppose that the triple $T = (E_1, E_2, \phi)$ is of the form in (7.21), i.e.*

$$0 \longrightarrow E_2 \xrightarrow{\phi} E_1 \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow 0,$$

with F locally free. Then there is an $\epsilon > 0$ such that F is semistable if the triple is α-semistable for any $\alpha > \alpha_M - \epsilon$. Indeed the conclusion holds for any

$$0 < \epsilon < \frac{2}{m(m-1)^2} \ , \tag{8.5}$$

where $m = n_1 - n_2 = \mathrm{rk}(F)$.

Proof. Let $F' \subset F$ be any proper subsheaf. Denote the rank and slope of F (resp. F') by m and μ_F (resp. m' and $\mu_{F'}$). We can always find $E_1' \subset E_1$ such that $F' = E_1'/E_2$, i.e. such that we have

$$0 \longrightarrow E_2 \xrightarrow{\phi} E_1' \longrightarrow F' \longrightarrow 0.$$

Let $T' = (E_1', E_2, \phi)$. For convenience, define

$$\Delta_\alpha \equiv \Delta_\alpha(T') = \mu_\alpha(T') - \mu_\alpha(T) \ . \tag{8.6}$$

Using

$$\begin{aligned} n_1 &= n_2 + m \ , \\ n_1' &= n_2 + m' \ , \\ n_1\mu_1 &= n_2\mu_2 + m\mu_F \ , \\ n_1'\mu_1' &= n_2\mu_2 + m'\mu_{F'} \ , \end{aligned} \tag{8.7}$$

we get

$$\mu_{F'} - \mu_F = \frac{(2n_2+m)(2n_2+m')}{2n_2m'}\Delta_\alpha - \left(\frac{m-m'}{2m'}\right)(\alpha - 2(\mu_F - \mu_2)) \ . \tag{8.8}$$

But $2(\mu_F - \mu_2) = \alpha_M$. Thus, setting

$$\alpha = \alpha_M - \epsilon \ , \tag{8.9}$$

we get

$$\mu_{F'} - \mu_F = \frac{(2n_2+m)(2n_2+m')}{2n_2m'}\Delta_\alpha + \left(\frac{m-m'}{m'}\right)\frac{\epsilon}{2} \ . \tag{8.10}$$

If now we take

$$\frac{\epsilon}{2} < \frac{1}{m(m-1)^2} \ ,$$

then for all $0 < m' < m$ we get

$$\left(\frac{m-m'}{m'}\right)\frac{\epsilon}{2} < \frac{1}{m(m-1)} \ . \tag{8.11}$$

Hence, if the triple is α-semistable, so that $\Delta_\alpha \leqslant 0$, then we get

$$\mu_{F'} - \mu_F < \frac{1}{m(m-1)} \ . \tag{8.12}$$

Since μ_F and $\mu_{F'}$ are rational numbers, the first with denominator m, and the second with denominator $m' \leqslant (m-1)$, equation (8.12) equivalent to the condition $\mu_{F'} - \mu_F \leqslant 0$. □

We can combine Propositions 7.6, 8.4 and 8.3 to obtain the following.

Proposition 8.5. *Let $T = (E_1, E_2, \phi)$ be an α-semistable triple for some α in the range $\alpha_L < \alpha < \alpha_M$. Then T is of the form*

$$0 \longrightarrow E_2 \xrightarrow{\phi} E_1 \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow 0,$$

with F locally free, and E_2 and F are semistable.

In the converse direction we have:

Proposition 8.6. *Let $T = (E_1, E_2, \phi)$ be a triple of the form*

$$0 \longrightarrow E_2 \xrightarrow{\phi} E_1 \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow 0,$$

with F locally free. If E_2 is semistable and F is stable then T is α-stable for $\alpha = \alpha_M - \epsilon$ in the range $\alpha_L < \alpha < \alpha_M$.

Proof. Any subtriple $T' = (E'_1, E'_2, \phi')$ defines a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & E_2 \arrow[r, "\phi"] & E_1 \arrow[r] & F \arrow[r] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & E'_2 \arrow[r, "\phi'"] \arrow[u] & E'_1 \arrow[r] \arrow[u] & F' \arrow[r] \arrow[u] & 0,
\end{tikzcd}$$

where $F' \subset F$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_\alpha \equiv \Delta_\alpha(T') &= \mu_\alpha(T') - \mu_\alpha(T) \\
&= \mu(E'_1 \oplus E'_2) - \mu(E_1 \oplus E_2) + \alpha(\frac{n'_2}{n'_1 + n'_2} - \frac{n_2}{n_1 + n_2}). \quad (8.13)
\end{aligned}$$

Denote the rank and slope of F (resp. F') by m and μ_F (resp. m' and $\mu_{F'}$). Using

$$\begin{aligned}
n_1 &= n_2 + m\ , \\
n'_1 &= n'_2 + m'\ , \\
n_1\mu_1 &= n_2\mu_2 + m\mu_F\ , \\
n'_1\mu'_1 &= n'_2\mu_2 + m'\mu_{F'}\ ,
\end{aligned}$$

and the fact that $\alpha_M = 2(\mu_F - \mu_2)$, and setting $\alpha = \alpha_M - \epsilon$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_\alpha = &\frac{2n'_2 + \mu'_2 + m\mu_{F'}}{2n'_2 + m'} - \frac{2n_2 + \mu_2 + m\mu_F}{2n_2 + m} + 2(\mu_F - \mu_2)(\frac{n'_2}{2n'_2 + m'} - \frac{n_2}{2n_2 + m}) \\
&- \epsilon(\frac{n'_2}{2n'_2 + m'} - \frac{n_2}{2n_2 + m}) \\
&= \frac{2n'_2}{2n'_2 + m'}(\mu'_2 - \mu_2) + \frac{m'}{2n'_2 + m'}(\mu_{F'} - \mu_F) - \epsilon(\frac{n'_2 m - n_2 m'}{(2n'_2 + m')(2n_2 + m)}). \\
& \qquad (8.14)
\end{aligned}$$

Clearing denominators in (8.14) we obtain

$$\hat{\Delta}_\alpha = n_2'(2\Delta_2 - \frac{m}{2n_2+m}\epsilon) + m'(\Delta_F + \frac{n_2}{2n_2+m}\epsilon), \tag{8.15}$$

where

$$\hat{\Delta}_\alpha = (2n_2' + m')\Delta_\alpha, \qquad \Delta_2 = \mu_2' - \mu_2, \qquad \text{and} \qquad \Delta_F = \mu_{F'} - \mu_F. \tag{8.16}$$

Now suppose that E_2 is semistable and F is stable. The semistability of E_2 implies that

$$2\Delta_2 - \frac{m}{2n_2+m}\epsilon < 0,$$

while the stability of F implies there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\Delta_F \leqslant -\delta < 0.$$

Thus by taking

$$\epsilon < \frac{2n_2+m}{n_2}\delta,$$

we have

$$\Delta_F + \frac{n_2}{2n_2+m}\epsilon < 0,$$

and hence $\Delta_\alpha < 0$, completing the proof. □

Theorem 8.7. *Let $n_1 > n_2$ and $d_1/n_1 > d_2/n_2$. The moduli space $\mathcal{N}_L^s(n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2)$ is smooth of dimension*

$$(g-1)(n_1^2 + n_2^2 - n_1 n_2) - n_1 d_2 + n_2 d_1 + 1,$$

and is birationally equivalent to a $\mathbb{P}^N$-fibration over $M^s(n_1 - n_2, d_1 - d_2) \times M^s(n_2, d_2)$, where

$$N = n_2 d_1 - n_1 d_2 + n_1(n_1 - n_2)(g-1) - 1.$$

In particular, $\mathcal{N}_L^s(n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2)$ is non-empty and irreducible.

If $\mathrm{GCD}(n_1 - n_2, d_1 - d_2) = 1$ *and* $\mathrm{GCD}(n_2, d_2) = 1$, *the birational equivalence is an isomorphism.*

Moreover, $\mathcal{N}_L(n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2)$ is irreducible and hence birationally equivalent to $\mathcal{N}_L^s(n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2)$.

Proof. For every triple $T = (E_1, E_2, \phi)$ in $\mathcal{N}_L^s(n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2)$, the homomorphism ϕ is injective and hence, by (5) in Proposition 5.21, T defines a smooth point in the moduli space, whose dimension is then given by (4) in Proposition 5.4.

Given $F \in M^s(n_1 - n_2, d_1 - d_2)$ and $E_2 \in M^s(n_2, d_2)$, we know from Proposition 5.4 that every extension

$$0 \longrightarrow E_2 \xrightarrow{\phi} E_1 \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow 0,$$

determines a triple $T = (E_1, E_2, \phi)$ in $\mathcal{N}_L^s(n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2)$. These extensions are classified by $H^1(E_2 \otimes F^*)$. In fact two classes defining the same element in the projectivatization $\mathbb{P}H^1(E_2 \otimes F^*)$ define equivalent extensions and therefore equivalent triples. Now,

$$\deg(E_2 \otimes F^*) = (n_1 - n_2)d_2 - n_2(d_1 - d_2) = n_1 n_2(\mu_2 - \mu_1) < 0$$

and, since $E_2 \otimes F^*$ is semistable, then $H^0(E_2 \otimes F^*) = 0$. Hence, by the Riemann–Roch theorem

$$h^1(E_2 \otimes F^*) = n_2 d_1 - n_1 d_2 + n_1(n_1 - n_2)(g - 1).$$

In particular this dimension is constant as F and E_2 vary in the corresponding moduli spaces.

We can describe this globally in terms of Picard sheaves. To do that we consider first the case in which $\mathrm{GCD}(n_1 - n_2, d_1 - d_2) = 1$ and $\mathrm{GCD}(n_2, d_2) = 1$. In this situation there exist universal bundles $\mathbb{F}$ and $\mathbb{E}_2$ over $X \times M(n_1 - n_2, d_1 - d_2)$ and $X \times M(n_2, d_2)$, respectively. Consider the canonical projections $\pi : XM(n_1 - n_2, d_1 - d_2) \times M(n_2, d_2) \times \rightarrow M(n_1 - n_2, d_1 - d_2) \times M(n_2, d_2)$ $\nu : X \times M(n_1 - n_2, d_1 - d_2) \times M(n_2, d_2) \rightarrow X \times M(n_1 - n_2, d_1 - d_2)$, and $\pi_2 : X \times M(n_1 - n_2, d_1 - d_2) \times M(n_2, d_2) \rightarrow X \times M(n_2, d_2)$. The Picard sheaf

$$\mathcal{S} := R^1 \pi_*(\pi_2^* \mathbb{E}_2 \otimes \nu^* \mathbb{F}^*),$$

is then locally free (a Picard bundle) and we can identify $\mathcal{N}_L(n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2) = \mathcal{N}_L^s(n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2)$ with $\mathcal{P} = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S})$. This is indeed a $\mathbb{P}^N$ fibration with $N = n_2 d_1 - n_1 d_2 + n_1(n_1 - n_2)(g - 1) - 1$, which in particular is non-empty since $M(n_1 - n_2, d_1 - d_2)$ and $M(n_2, d_2)$ are non-empty and $N > 0$.

If $\mathrm{GCD}(n_1 - n_2, d_1 - d_2) \neq 1$ and $\mathrm{GCD}(n_2, d_2) \neq 1$, the universal bundles and hence the Picard bundle do not exist but the projectivization over $M^s(n_1 - n_2, d_1 - d_2) \times M^s(n_2, d_2)$ does. One way to show this is to work in the open set R of the Quot scheme corresponding to stable bundles.

The point is that an appropriate linear group GL acts on R, with the centre acting trivially and such that PGL acts freely with the quotient being $M^s(n_1 - n_2, d_1 - d_2) \times M^s(n_2, d_2)$. For the action on the projective bundle associated to the universal bundle over R, the centre of GL still acts trivially, and one can use standard descent arguments to obtain a $\mathbb{P}^N$ fibration $\mathcal{P}$ over $M^s(n_1 - n_2, d_1 - d_2) \times M^s(n_2, d_2)$.

W now show that $\mathcal{N}_L^s(n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2) - \mathcal{P}$ has strict positive codimension in $\mathcal{N}_L^s(n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2)$. This follows from two facts. The first one is that any family of semistable bundles of rank $n_1 - n_2$ and degree $d_1 - d_2$ depends on a number of parameters strictly less than the dimension of $M^s(n_1 - n_2, d_1 - d_2)$ (similarly for any family of semistable bundles of rank n_2 and degree d_2). The second fact is that the dimension of $H^1(E_2 \otimes F^*)$ is fixed by the Riemann–Roch theorem (we use here that E_2 and F are semistable).

To prove the last statement, i.e. to extend the results to $\mathcal{N}_L(n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2)$, we consider the family $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ of equivalence classes of extensions

$$0 \longrightarrow E_2 \xrightarrow{\phi} E_1 \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow 0,$$

where F and E_2 are semistable. Clearly, $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ contains the family $\mathcal{P}$. The family $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ is irreducible. This is because since F and E_2 are semistable they vary (for fixed ranks and degrees) in irreducible families $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{E}_2$, respectively, and as shown above $H^0(E_2 \otimes F^*) = 0$. Hence $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ is a projective bundle over $\mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{E}_2$. From Proposition 8.5, we know that $\mathcal{N}_L(n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{P}}$, and since α-semistability is an open condition we have that $\mathcal{N}_L(n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2)$ is irreducible. □

Remark 8.8. If $n_1 < n_2$, we have an analogous theorem for $\mathcal{N}_L^s(n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2)$ via the isomorphism

$$\mathcal{N}_\alpha^s(n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2) = \mathcal{N}_\alpha^s(n_2, n_1, -d_2, -d_1)$$

given by duality.

8.3 Moduli space for $2g - 2 \leqslant \alpha < \alpha_M$

Theorem 8.9. *Let α be any value in the range $2g - 2 \leqslant \alpha < \alpha_M$. Then $\mathcal{N}_\alpha^s$ is birationally equivalent to $\mathcal{N}_L^s$. In particular it is non-empty and irreducible.*

Proof. This follows from Corollary 6.20 and Theorem 8.7. □

Corollary 8.10. *Let* (n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2) *be such that* $\mathrm{GCD}(n_2, n_1+n_2, d_1+d_2) = 1$*. If* α *is a generic value satisfying* $2g-2 \leqslant \alpha < \alpha_M$*, then* $\mathcal{N}_\alpha$ *is birationally equivalent to* $\mathcal{N}_L$*, and in particular it is irreducible.*

Proof. From (4) in Proposition 5.4 one has that $\mathcal{N}_\alpha = \mathcal{N}_\alpha^s$ if $\mathrm{GCD}(n_2, n_1 + n_2, d_1 + d_2) = 1$ and α is generic. In particular, $\mathcal{N}_L = \mathcal{N}_L^s$, and hence the result follows from Theorem 8.9. □

9 Moduli space of triples with $n_1 = n_2$

Throughout this section we will assume that $n_1 = n_2 = n$ and $d_1 \geqslant d_2$.

9.1 Moduli space for $d_1 = d_2$

Proposition 9.1. *Suppose that* $n_1 = n_2 = n$ *and* $d_1 = d_2 = d$*. Let* $T = (E_1, E_2, \phi)$ *be a triple of type* (n_1, n_2, d_1, d_2)*, and let* $\alpha > 0$*. Then* T *is* α*-(poly)stable if and only if* E_1 *and* E_2 *are (poly)stable and* ϕ *is an isomorphism.*

Proof. In this case $\alpha_0 = \alpha_m = 0$ and hence for every α-semistable triple $T = (E_1, E_2, \phi)$ with $\alpha > 0$, ϕ must be injective and therefore an isomorphism. The polystability of E_1 and E_2 is now straightforward to see. To show the converse, suppose that E_1 and E_2 are both polystable and let $T' = (E_1', E_2', \phi')$ be any subtriple of T.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_\alpha(T') &= \mu(E_1' \oplus E_2') + \alpha\frac{n_2'}{n_1' + n_2'} \\
&\leqslant \mu(E_1 \oplus E_2) + \alpha\frac{n_2'}{n_1' + n_2'} \\
&\leqslant \mu_\alpha(T) + \alpha(\frac{n_2'}{n_1' + n_2'} - \frac{1}{2}) \\
&\leqslant \mu_\alpha(T),
\end{aligned}$$

since $n_1' \geqslant n_2'$ for ϕ is injective.

□

Corollary 9.2. *There is a surjective map from* $\mathcal{N}_\alpha(n, n, d, d)$ *to* $M(n, d)$ *which defines an isomorphism between the two moduli spaces. In particular* $\mathcal{N}_\alpha(n, n, d, d)$ *is non-empty and irreducible.*

Proof. From Proposition 9.1 it is clear that we have a surjective map, say

$$\pi : \mathcal{N}_\alpha(n, n, d, d) \to M(n, d) \ .$$

Suppose that $\pi([T]) = \pi([T'])$, where $[T]$ and $[T']$ are points in $\mathcal{N}_\alpha(n, n, d, d)$ represented by triples $T = (E, E, \phi)$ and $T' = (E', E', \phi')$ respectively. We may assume that T and T' are polystable triples, and hence that E and E' are polystable bundles. Thus, since $\pi([T]) = \pi([T'])$, we can find an isomorphism $h_1 : E \mapsto E'$. Set $h_2 = \phi' \circ h_1 \circ \phi^{-1}$ (remember that ϕ and ϕ' are bundle isomorphisms!). Then (h_1, h_2) defines an isomorphism form T to T'. Thus π is injective. ☐

9.2 Bounds on E_1 and E_2 for $\alpha > \alpha_0$

Lemma 9.3. *Let (E_1, E_2, ϕ) be a triple with $\ker \phi = 0$. Let (E_1', E_2', ϕ') be a subtriple with $n_1' = n_2' = n'$. Thus we get the following diagram, in which S and S' are torsion sheaves:*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & E_2 \arrow[r, "\phi"] & E_1 \arrow[r] & S \arrow[r] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & E_2' \arrow[r, "\phi'"] \arrow[u] & E_1' \arrow[r] \arrow[u] & S' \arrow[r] \arrow[u] & 0.
\end{tikzcd}$$

Then

$$\Delta_\alpha(T') \equiv \mu_\alpha(T') - \mu_\alpha(T) = (\mu(E_2') - \mu_2) + \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{s'}{n'} - \frac{s}{n}\right)$$
$$= (\mu(E_1') - \mu_1) - \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{s'}{n'} - \frac{s}{n}\right).$$

Here s and s' are the degrees of S and S' respectively.

Proof. From the above diagram we get

$$n\mu_2 + s = n\mu_1 \ ,$$
$$n\mu(E_2') + s' = n\mu(E_1') \ .$$

Thus

$$\mu_\alpha(T') = \frac{1}{2}(\mu(E_1') + \mu(E_2')) + \frac{\alpha}{2} = \frac{1}{2}\left(2\mu(E_2') + \frac{s'}{n'}\right) + \frac{\alpha}{2}$$
$$= \frac{1}{2}\left(2\mu(E_1') - \frac{s'}{n'}\right) + \frac{\alpha}{2},$$

and similarly for $\mu_\alpha(T)$. ☐

Proposition 9.4. *Let (E_1, E_2, ϕ) be an α-semistable triple with* $\ker \phi = 0$. *Then*

(1) *For any subsheaf $E_1' \subset E_1$*

$$\mu(E_1') \leqslant \mu_1 + \frac{1}{2}(n-1)(\mu_1 - \mu_2) \ .$$

(2) *For any subsheaf $E_2' \subset E_2$*

$$\mu(E_2') \leqslant \mu_2 + \frac{1}{2}(\mu_1 - \mu_2) \ .$$

Proof. Since $\ker \phi = 0$ the results of Lemma 9.3 apply. Furthermore, any subsheaf $E_1' \subset E_1$ is part of a subtriple (E_1', E_2', ϕ') with $n_1' = n_2' = n'$. Likewise, given any subsheaf $E_2' \subset E_2$, we can take $E_1' = \phi(E_2')$. Thus we can use the results of Lemma 9.3, plus the fact that α-stability implies $\Delta_\alpha(T') < 0$ for all subtriples, to conclude

$$\mu(E_1') - \mu_1 - \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{s'}{n'} - \frac{s}{n}\right) < 0$$

for all $E_1' \subset E_1$. Similarly

$$\mu(E_2') - \mu_2 + \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{s'}{n'} - \frac{s}{n}\right) < 0$$

for all $E_2' \subset E_2$. The results now follow using the fact that $0 \leqslant s' \leqslant s$ and $1 \leqslant n' < n$. ☐

9.3 Stabilization of moduli

Theorem 9.5 (Stabilization Theorem). *Let α_0 be as in (7.15).*

(1) *If $\alpha_1, \ \alpha_2$ be any real numbers such that $\alpha_0 < \alpha_1 \leqslant \alpha_2$,*

$$\mathcal{N}_{\alpha_1}(n, n, d_1, d_2) \subseteq \mathcal{N}_{\alpha_2}(n, n, d_1, d_2).$$

(2) *There is a real number $\alpha_L \geqslant \alpha_0$ such that*

$$\mathcal{N}_{\alpha_1}(n, n, d_1, d_2) = \mathcal{N}_{\alpha_2}(n, n, d_1, d_2)$$

for all $\alpha_1 \geqslant \alpha_2 > \alpha_L$.

Proof. (1). Recall from 7.3 that if $\alpha > \alpha_0$ then any triple, say $T = (E_1, E_2, \phi)$, in $\mathcal{N}_\alpha(n, n, d_1, d_2)$ has $\mathrm{rk}(\phi) = n$. It follows that in any subtriple, say $T' = (E_1', E_2', \phi')$, the rank of E_1' is at least as big as the rank of E_2', i.e. $n_1' \geqslant n_2'$. We treat the cases $n_1' > n_2'$ and $n_1' = n_2'$ separately. In both cases we must show that

$$\Delta_{\alpha_1}(T') \leqslant 0 \;\Rightarrow\; \Delta_{\alpha_2}(T') \leqslant 0$$

if $\alpha_1 \leqslant \alpha_2$. If $n_1' = n_2'$ then for any α

$$\Delta_\alpha(T') = \mu(E_1' \oplus E_2') - \mu(E_1 \oplus E_2) \ . \tag{9.1}$$

In particular, $\Delta_\alpha(T')$ is independent of α and hence $\Delta_{\alpha_1}(T') = \Delta_{\alpha_2}(T')$. If $n_1' > n_2'$, then for any α

$$\Delta_\alpha(T') = \mu(E_1' \oplus E_2') - \mu(E_1 \oplus E_2) + \left(\frac{n_2'}{n_1' + n_2'} - \frac{1}{2}\right)\alpha. \tag{9.2}$$

For each subtriple, $\Delta_\alpha(T')$ is thus a linear function of α, with slope

$$\lambda(T') \;=\; \left(\frac{n_2'}{n_1' + n_2'} - \frac{1}{2}\right) \;=\; \frac{n_2' - n_1'}{2(n_1' + n_2')} \tag{9.3}$$

and constant term

$$M(T') = \mu(E_1' \oplus E_2') - \mu(E_1 \oplus E_2) \ . \tag{9.4}$$

We see that if $n_1' > n_2'$ then $\lambda(T') < 0$. It follows from this that

$$\Delta_{\alpha_1}(T') \leqslant 0 \implies \Delta_{\alpha_2}(T') \leqslant 0$$

if $\alpha_1 \leqslant \alpha_2$. (2). Consider any α_1, α_2 such that $\alpha_0 < \alpha_1 \leqslant \alpha_2$. By Part (1), the difference (if any) between $\mathcal{N}_{\alpha_1}$ and $\mathcal{N}_{\alpha_2}$ is due entirely to triples which are α_2-stable but not α_1-stable. Any such triple must have a subobject, say $T' = (E_1', E_2', \phi')$, for which

$$\Delta_{\alpha_2}(T') \leqslant 0 < \Delta_{\alpha_1}(T') \ . \tag{9.5}$$

As in (1), we need only consider subobjects for which the rank of E_1' is at least as big as the rank of E_2', i.e. $n_1' \geqslant n_2'$. Clearly (9.5) is not possible for a subobject with $n_1' = n_2'$ (since in that case $\Delta_{\alpha_1}(T') = \Delta_{\alpha_2}(T')$). Suppose then that $n_1' > n_2'$. By (9.2) and the fact that for such a subobject $\lambda(T') < 0$, we get that

$$\Delta_\alpha(T') \geqslant 0 \iff \alpha \leqslant \frac{M(T')}{-\lambda(T')} \ . \tag{9.6}$$

We claim that there is a bound, α_L, depending only on the degrees and ranks of E_1 and E_2, such that

$$\frac{M(T')}{-\lambda(T')} \leqslant \alpha_L \tag{9.7}$$

for all possible subtriples with $n_1' > n_2'$. For a triple $T = (E_1, E_2, \phi)$ in $\mathcal{N}_{\alpha_2}$ Proposition 9.4 applies, giving upper bounds on slopes of subsheaves of both E_1 and E_2. Using these bounds we compute

$$M(T') \leqslant \frac{nn_1'}{2(n_1' + n_2')}(\mu_1 - \mu_2) \ . \tag{9.8}$$

Combined with (9.3), this gives

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{M(T')}{-\lambda(T')} &\leqslant \frac{nn_1'}{(n_1' - n_2')}(\mu_1 - \mu_2) \\ &\leqslant n(n-1)(\mu_1 - \mu_2).\end{aligned}$$

We can thus take

$$\alpha_L = n(n-1)(\mu_1 - \mu_2) \ . \tag{9.9}$$

We can now complete the proof of Part (2): if $\alpha_1 > \alpha_L$ then no triple in $\mathcal{N}_{\alpha_2}$ can have a subobject satisfying (9.6). Hence $\mathcal{N}_{\alpha_2} = \mathcal{N}_{\alpha_1}$. □

Remark 9.6. If $n = 2$ then $\alpha_L = \alpha_0 = d_1 - d_2$, i.e. the stabilization parameter coincides with the injectivity parameter.

It is clear from (9.9) that $\alpha_L = 0$ correspond to the following especial cases.

Proposition 9.7. *The condition $\alpha_L = 0$ holds if and only if $n = 1$ or $\alpha_m = 0$. Hence if ϵ is any positive real number:*

1. *If $n = 1$, the moduli space for every $\alpha \in (\alpha_m, \infty)$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{N}_{\alpha_m + \epsilon}(1, 1, d_1, d_2)$,*
2. *If $\alpha_m = 0$, the moduli space for every $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{N}_\epsilon(n, n, d_1, d_2)$.*

9.4 Moduli for large α and $\alpha \geqslant 2g-2$

Let $\alpha > \alpha_0$. By Corollary 7.3, we know that all triples in $\mathcal{N}_\alpha(n,n,d_1,d_2)$ are of the form

$$0 \longrightarrow E_2 \xrightarrow{\phi} E_1 \longrightarrow S \longrightarrow 0, \tag{9.10}$$

where S is a torsion sheaf of degree $d = d_1 - d_2$.

Theorem 9.8 (Markman-Xia [26]). *There is an irreducible family $\mathcal{S}$ parameterizing quotients $E_1 \longrightarrow S \longrightarrow 0$, where E_1 is a rank n and degree d_1 locally free coherent sheaf varying on a bounded family, and S is a torsion sheaf of degree $d > 0$.*

Theorem 9.9. *Let $\alpha > \alpha_0$, then $\mathcal{N}_\alpha(n,n,d_1,d_2)$ is irreducible.*

Proof. Since $\alpha > \alpha_0$, an α-semistable triple $T = (E_1, E_2, \phi)$ defines a sequence as in (9.10) and hence a quotient $E_1 \longrightarrow S \longrightarrow 0$ in $\mathcal{S}$. That E_1 varies on a bounded family is a consequence of (1) in Proposition 9.4. Indeed, let E be a vector bundle of degree d and rank n satisfying

$$\mu(E') \leqslant B \tag{9.11}$$

for all subbundles $E' \subset E$, and fixed B. But then (see, for instance, the proof of Theorem 5.6.1 in [25]) we can find a line bundle L of sufficiently high degree such that $H^1(E \otimes L) = 0$ for all E which satisfy (9.11). The irreducibility of $\mathcal{N}_\alpha(n,n,d_1,d_2)$ follows now from the irreducibility of $\mathcal{S}$ and the fact that α-semistability is an open condition. $\square$

By analogy with the $n_1 \neq n_2$, let us denote by $\mathcal{N}_L(n,n,d_1,d_2)$ the 'large α' moduli space, i.e. the moduli space of α-semistable triples for any $\alpha \in (\alpha_L, \infty)$. Since $\alpha_L \geqslant \alpha_0$ we have that all triples in $\mathcal{N}_L(n,d_1,d_2)$ are of the form

$$0 \longrightarrow E_2 \xrightarrow{\phi} E_1 \longrightarrow S \longrightarrow 0\ ,$$

and that E_1 and E_2 are bounded by the constraints in Proposition 9.4.

In the converse direction we have

Proposition 9.10. *Let $T = (E_1, E_2, \phi)$ be a triple such that $\ker\phi = 0$ If E_1 and E_2 are semistable, then T is α-semistable for large enough α, i.e. $T \in \mathcal{N}(n,n,d_1,d_2)$. If either E_1 or E_2 is stable, then T is α-stable.*

Proof. Since $\ker\phi = 0$, it follows (as in the proof of Theorem 9.5) that in any subtriple, say $T' = (E'_1, E'_2, \phi')$, the rank of E'_1 is at least as big as the rank of E'_2, i.e. $n'_1 \geqslant n'_2$. If $n'_1 > n'_2$, then (9.2), (9.3) and (9.4) apply, with $\lambda(T') < 0$ and $\frac{M(T')}{-\lambda(T')} \leqslant \alpha_L$. Thus $\Delta_\alpha < 0$ whenever $\alpha > \alpha_L$. For subtriples with $n'_1 = n'_2$, equation (9.1) applies, i.e.

$$\Delta_\alpha(T') = \mu(E'_1 \oplus E'_2) - \mu(E_1 \oplus E_2)$$

for any α. For such subtriples, and for any α, it thus follows that

(1) $\Delta_\alpha(T') \leqslant 0$ if both E_1 and E_2 are semistable, and

(2) $\Delta_\alpha(T') < 0$ if at least one of the bundles is stable.

□

Theorem 9.11. *The moduli space $\mathcal{N}^s_L(n, n, d_1, d_2)$ is non-empty.*

Proof. Our strategy is to show that there exist rank n stable bundles E_1 and E_2 of degree d_1 and d_2, respectively, and a torsion sheaf S of degree $d_1 - d_2$, fitting in an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow E_2 \longrightarrow E_1 \longrightarrow S \longrightarrow 0.$$

The result will then follow from Proposition 9.10.

To prove this, let E be a vector bundle, and let $\mathrm{Quot}^d(E)$ be the Quot scheme of quotients $E \longrightarrow S$ where S is a torsion sheaf of degree d. The basic fact we will need is the following result of R. Hernández ([21]): Let $\psi : \mathcal{O}^n \longrightarrow S$ be an element in $\mathrm{Quot}^d(\mathcal{O}^n)$, then for a generic S, the vector bundle $E = \ker\psi$ is stable. Notice that $\deg E = -d$. By tensoring with a line bundle L of big enough degree (depending on n and d), we can extend the result to $\mathrm{Quot}^d(L^n)$, so that the kernel of any element in $\mathrm{Quot}^d(L^n)$ has a given (fixed) degree.

Let L be a line bundle of degree m and $d'' > 0$ such that $d_1 = nm - d''$. By Hernández result, if $\psi : L^n \longrightarrow S'' \in \mathrm{Quot}^{d''}(L^n)$ is generic, then $E_1 = \ker\psi$ is a stable bundle of rank n and degree d_1. Let $d = d_1 - d_2$ and consider a generic element $\eta : E_1 \longrightarrow S \in \mathrm{Quot}^d(E_1)$. Let $E_2 = \ker\eta$, and let S' the cokernel of the natural inclusion $E_2 \longrightarrow L^n$. We have the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & 0 \arrow[d] & 0 \arrow[d] & 0 \arrow[d] & \\
0 \arrow[r] & E_2 \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & E_1 \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & S \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & E_2 \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & L^n \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & S' \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
 & 0 \arrow[r] & S'' \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d] & S'' \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
 & & 0 & 0. &
\end{tikzcd}$$

We see from the diagram that E_2 coincides with the kernel of $L^n \longrightarrow S'$. If S' is general enough we can again apply the basic result of Hernández and conclude that E_2 is stable. To show that this is indeed the case, we observe that the diagram defines a map

$$\mathrm{Quot}_0^d(E_1) \times \mathrm{Quot}_0^{d''}(L^n) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Quot}_0^{d+d''}(L^n),$$

where Quot_0 denotes an open non-empty subscheme of Quot, which is surjective and finite. □

Proposition 9.12. *The moduli space $\mathcal{N}_L(n, n, d_1, d_2)$ is birationally equivalent to a $\mathbb{P}^N$-fibration $\mathcal{P}$ over $M^s(n, d_2) \times \mathrm{Div}^d(X)$, where $N = n(d_1 - d_2) - 1$.*

Proof. Let E_2 be a rank n and degree d_2 vector bundle and let S be a torsion sheaf of degree $d > 0$. We construct E_1 as an extension

$$0 \longrightarrow E_2 \longrightarrow E_1 \longrightarrow S \longrightarrow 0. \tag{9.12}$$

Such extensions are parameterized by $\mathrm{Ext}^1(S, E_2)$. Suppose that S is of the form $S = \mathcal{O}_D$, where D is a divisor in $\mathrm{Div}^d(X)$. Let L be a line bundle. Consider the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow L^*(-D) \longrightarrow L^* \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_D \longrightarrow 0,$$

and apply to it the functor $\mathrm{Hom}(\cdot, E_2)$, to obtain the long exact sequence

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & H^0(E_2 \otimes L) & \longrightarrow & H^0(E_2 \otimes L(D)) & \longrightarrow & \\ \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_D, E_2) & \longrightarrow & H^1(E_2 \otimes L) & \longrightarrow & H^1(E_2 \otimes L(D)) & \longrightarrow & 0. \end{array} \tag{9.13}$$

We thus have

$$\dim \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_D, E_2) = \chi(E_2 \otimes L) - \chi(E_2 \otimes L(D)) = nd,$$

which is positive since we are assuming $d > 0$. Taking L so that $\deg(L) >> 0$, we have that $H^1(E_2 \otimes L) = 0$. If E_2 is semistable (or more generally it moves in a bounded family) we can take the same L for every E_2. Then

$$\mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_D, E_2) = H^0(E_2 \otimes L(D))/H^0(E_2 \otimes L).$$

Let $\mathcal{P}$ be the set of equivalence classes of extensions (9.12), where E_2 is stable then $\mathcal{P}$ is a $\mathbb{P}^N$-fibration over $M^s(n, d_2) \times \mathrm{Div}^d(X)$, where $N = nd - 1 = \dim \mathbb{P}(\mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_D, E_2))$. Setting $d = d_1 - d_2$, a simple computation shows that

$$\dim \mathcal{P} = (g-1)(n_1^2 + n_2^2 - n_1 n_2) - n_1 d_2 + n_2 d_1 + 1.$$

Cleary $\mathcal{P}$ is irreducible of the same dimension as $\mathcal{N}_L$, and since it is contained in $\mathcal{S}$ (like $\mathcal{N}_L$) it must birationally equivalent to $\mathcal{N}_L$. Notice that If $\mathrm{GCD}(n, d_2) = 1$, then $\mathcal{P}$ is a Picard sheaf. □

Combining Theorems 9.9 and 9.11, and Proposition 9.12 we have the following.

Theorem 9.13. . *The moduli space $\mathcal{N}_L(n, n, d_1, d_2)$ is non-empty and irreducible. Moreover, it is birationally equivalent to a $\mathbb{P}^N$-fibration over $M^s(n, d_2) \times \mathrm{Div}^d(X)$, where the fiber dimension is $N = n(d_1 - d_2) - 1$.*

Theorem 9.14. *Let $\alpha \geqslant 2g - 2$. Then*

1. *The moduli space $\mathcal{N}^s_\alpha$ is birationally equivalent to $\mathcal{N}_L$ and it is hence non-empty and irreducible.*
2. *If in addition either*
    - $\mathrm{GCD}(n, 2n, d_1 + d_2) = 1$ *and $\alpha \geqslant 2g - 2$ is generic, or*
    - $d_1 - d_2 < \alpha$,

   then $\mathcal{N}_\alpha(n, n, d_1, d_2)$ is birationally equivalent to $\mathcal{N}_L(n, n, d_1, d_2)$ and hence irreducible.

Proof. (1) From Theorem 9.9 we know that $\mathcal{N}_L$ is birationally equivalent to $\mathcal{N}^s_L$. The result follows now from Corollary 6.20 and Theorem 9.13.

(2) For the first part, we observe that from (4) in Proposition 5.4 one has that $\mathcal{N}_\alpha = \mathcal{N}^s_\alpha$ if $\mathrm{GCD}(n, 2n, d_1 + d_2) = 1$ and α is generic, and hence the result follows from (1). The second part is a consequence of Theorem 9.9. □

10 Existence and connectedness for $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$ and $\mathrm{PU}(p,q)$ moduli spaces

We now return to the representation spaces $\mathcal{R}(\mathrm{PU}(p,q))$ and $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(\mathrm{U}(p,q))$, defined in section 2. Recall that we identified components of $\mathcal{R}(\mathrm{PU}(p,q))$ labeled by $[a,b] \in \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}/(p+q)\mathbb{Z}$, and similarly identified components of $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(\mathrm{U}(p,q))$ labeled by $(a,b) \in \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}$.

By Proposition 2.2 $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(a,b)$ is a $\mathrm{U}(1)^{2g}$-fibration over $\mathcal{R}[a,b]$, and hence the number of connected components of $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(a,b)$ is greater than or equal to that of $\mathcal{R}[a,b]$. By Proposition 3.12 there is an homeomorphism between $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(a,b)$ and the moduli space $\mathcal{M}(a,b)$ of $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundles and this restricts to give a homeomorphism between the subspace $\mathcal{R}^*_\Gamma(a,b)$ of irreducible elements in $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(a,b)$ and the subspace $\mathcal{M}^s(a,b)$ of stable Higgs bundles in $\mathcal{M}(a,b)$. By Proposition 4.2 the number of connected components of $\mathcal{M}(a,b)$ is determined by the number of connected components in the subspace of local minima for the Bott-Morse function defined in Section 4.1. By Theorem 5.9 we can identify the subspace of local minima as a moduli space of α-stable triples, with $\alpha = 2g-2$. Summarizing, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
|\pi_0(\mathcal{R}[a,b])| &\leqslant |\pi_0(\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(a,b))| && \text{[Proposition 2.2]}\\
&\leqslant |\pi_0(\mathcal{M}(a,b))| && \text{[Proposition 3.12]}\\
&\leqslant |\pi_0(\mathcal{N}(a,b))| && \text{[Proposition 4.2]}\\
&= |\pi_0(\mathcal{N}_{2g-2}(n_1,n_2,d_1,d_2))| && \text{[Proposition 5.9]}
\end{aligned}$$

where $|\pi_0(\cdot)|$ denotes the number of components, and (in the notation of Section 5) the moduli space of triples which appears in the last line is either $\mathcal{N}_{2g-2}(p,q,a+p(2g-2),b)$ (if $a/p \leqslant b/q$) or $\mathcal{N}_{2g-2}(q,p,b+q(2g-2),a)$ (if $a/p \geqslant b/q$). Similarly, replacing Proposition 4.2 with Proposition 4.18, we get that

$$|\pi_0(\bar{\mathcal{R}}^*[a,b])| \leqslant |\pi_0(\bar{\mathcal{N}}^s_{2g-2}(n_1,n_2,d_1,d_2))| \ .$$

In particular, if the moduli spaces of triples are connected, then so are the spaces $\mathcal{R}[a,b]$ and $\bar{\mathcal{R}}^*[a,b]$.

We use the results of Sections 6-9 to determine the connectedness of the spaces $\mathcal{N}_{2g-2}(p,q,a+p(2g-2),b)$ and $\mathcal{N}_{2g-2}(q,p,b+q(2g-2),a)$. Our main tool is Corollary 6.20, which allows us convert the problem into one of counting the components for $\mathcal{N}_L$, the moduli space of α-stable triples for sufficiently large α. In the case $p \neq q$, Theorem 8.7 and its dual supply the requisite details. The results in Section 9 cover the the case $p = q$, which is not as well understood as the case $p \neq q$.

Before presenting specific results, we make some general observations.

10.1 Toledo invariant and the number of components

As described in Section 3.4, it is useful to introduce the combination

$$\tau := \tau(a, b) = \frac{2}{n}(qa - pb)$$

known as the Toledo invariant. Throughout this section, for convenience, we set $n = p + q$.

The map $(a, b) \mapsto \tau(a, b)$ defines an invariant on each component $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(a, b)$. Moreover, since the map factors through $\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}/(p+q)\mathbb{Z}$, it defines an invariant of $\mathcal{R}[a, b]$, where it takes the same value as on $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(a, b)$.

Proposition 10.1. *Suppose that* $\mathrm{GCD}(p, q) = k$. *Then the map*

$$\begin{aligned} \tau :& \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}/(p, q)\mathbb{Z} \longrightarrow \frac{2}{n}\mathbb{Z} \\ &[a, b] \mapsto \frac{2}{n}(aq - bp) \end{aligned}$$

fits in an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z} \xrightarrow{\sigma} \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}/(p, q)\mathbb{Z} \xrightarrow{\tau} \tfrac{2k}{n}\mathbb{Z} \longrightarrow 0 \tag{10.1}$$

where the map σ *is* $[t] \mapsto [t\frac{p}{k}, t\frac{q}{k}]$. *In particular,* τ *is a* $k : 1$ *map onto the subset* $\frac{2k}{n}\mathbb{Z} \subset \frac{2}{n}\mathbb{Z}$.

Proof. The map σ is clearly injective, and $\tau \circ \sigma = 0$. To see that $\ker(\tau) = \mathrm{im}(\sigma)$, observe that if $\tau[a, b] = 0$ then either $a = b = 0$ or $\frac{a}{b} = \frac{p}{q}$, i.e. $[a, b] = [t\frac{p}{k}, t\frac{q}{k}]$ for some $t \in \mathbb{Z}$. Finally, if $a_0 q - b_0 p = k$, then for any $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have $\tau[la_0, lb_0] = \frac{2k}{n}l$. Thus τ is surjective onto $\frac{2k}{n}\mathbb{Z}$. ☐

Remark 10.2. Proposition 10.1 shows why we must[4]use $[a, b]$ rather than τ to label the components of $\mathcal{R}(\mathrm{PU}(p, q))$ or of $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(\mathrm{U}(p, q))$. There are, nevertheless, important features of $\mathcal{R}[a, b]$ and $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(a, b)$ which depend on τ rather than on $[a, b]$ or (a, b). The rigidity result described in Section 3.6 is one such feature. Others emerge in the analysis of the minimal submanifolds, i.e. in the moduli spaces $\mathcal{N}_{2g-2}(p, q, a+p(2g-2), b)$ and $\mathcal{N}_{2g-2}(q, p, b+q(2g-2), a)$. In particular, for triples of the indicated type, the key critical values of the stability parameter α (i.e. $\alpha_m, \alpha_0, \alpha_t, \alpha_M$, in the notation of Section 5-9), as well as the all-important location of $2g-2$ within the interval (α_m, α_M), are all determined by τ.

---

[4] Unless p and q are coprime, in which case the correspondence between $[a, b]$ and τ is 1-1.

Proposition 10.1 allows us to count the number of components in the decomposition $\mathcal{R}(\mathrm{PU}(p,q)) = \bigcup_{(p,q)} \mathcal{R}[a,b]$. Recall (from Section 3.4) that if $p \leqslant q$ then the Toledo invariant is bounded by $|\tau| \leqslant \tau_M = 2p(g-1)$. Thus the set of allowed values for τ is contained in $[-\tau_M, \tau_M] \cap \frac{2}{n}\mathbb{Z}$.

Definition 10.3. *Suppose that* $\mathrm{GCD}(p,q) = k$. *Define*

$$\mathcal{C} = \tau^{-1}([-\tau_M, \tau_M] \cap \frac{2k}{n}\mathbb{Z}) \ , \tag{10.2}$$

where τ *is the map defined in Proposition 10.1.*

The following is then an immediate corollary of Proposition 10.1.

Corollary 10.4. *Suppose that* $\mathrm{GCD}(p,q) = k$ *and* $\mathcal{C}$ *is as above. Then* $\mathcal{C}$ *is precisely the set of all the points in* $\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}/(p,q)\mathbb{Z}$ *which label components* $\mathcal{R}[a,b]$ *in* $\mathcal{R}(\mathrm{PU}(p,q))$. *The cardinality of* $\mathcal{C}$ *is*

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathcal{C}| &= 2n\min\{p,q\}(g-1) + k \\ &= |([-\tau_M, \tau_M] \cap \frac{2}{n}\mathbb{Z})| + \mathrm{GCD}(p,q) - 1 \ .\end{aligned}$$

Proof. The first statement is a direct consequence of Proposition 10.1 and the bound on τ. Suppose for definiteness that $\min\{p,q\} = p$. Then since $\tau_M = 2\min\{p,q\}(g-1) = \frac{2k}{n}(n\frac{p}{k}(g-1)) \in \frac{2k}{n}\mathbb{Z}$, the number of points in $[-\tau_M, \tau_M] \cap \frac{2k}{n}\mathbb{Z}$ is $2n\frac{p}{k}(g-1) + 1$. The second statement now follows from the fact that τ is a $k:1$ map. The proof is similar if $\min\{p,q\} = q$. ☐

10.2 Genericity of 2g-2 and coprimality conditions

In general the Higgs moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}(a,b)$ and also the triples moduli spaces $\mathcal{N}_{2g-2}(p, q, a+p(2g-2), b)$ and $\mathcal{N}_{2g-2}(q, p, b+q(2g-2), a)$, are not smooth. In both the Higgs and the triples moduli spaces, the singularities occur at points representing strictly semistable objects. Apart from complications caused by such singularities, further difficulties can arise if $2g-2$ is not a generic value in the range of the stability parameter for the triples.

We now show that both types of problems are avoided if we make the assumption that $p+q$ and $a+b$ are coprime, i.e. that $\mathrm{GCD}(p+q, a+b) = 1$.

Proposition 10.5. *Suppose that* $\mathrm{GCD}(p+q, a+b) = 1$*. Then*

1. $\mathcal{M}(a,b)$ *is smooth,*
2. $\alpha = 2g-2$ *is not a critical value for triples of type* $(p, q, a+p(2g-2), b)$ *or* $(q, p, b+q(2g-2), a)$*, and*
3. *The moduli spaces* $\mathcal{N}_{2g-2}(p, q, a+p(2g-2), b)$ *and* $\mathcal{N}_{2g-2}(q, p, b+q(2g-2), a)$ *are smooth.*

Proof. The first statement is simply a restatement of Remark 3.13. The second and third statements follow from Lemma 5.7. Indeed, for triples of type $(p, q, a+p(2g-2), b)$, the coprime condition in that lemma becomes

$$\mathrm{GCD}(p+q, a+b+(2g-2)(p+q)) = 1\ . \tag{10.3}$$

But (10.3) is equivalent to $\mathrm{GCD}(p+q, a+b) = 1$. The proof is similar for triples of type $(q, p, b+q(2g-2), a)$. □

Recall that p and q are fixed, but $[a,b]$ runs over $\mathcal{C}$, the indexing set for the components $\mathcal{R}[a,b]$. The coprime condition $\mathrm{GCD}(p+q, a+b) = 1$ can thus be satisfied on some components but not on others.

Proposition 10.6. *Fix* p *and* q *and let* $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}/(p+q)\mathbb{Z}$ *be as in Definition 10.3. Let* $\mathcal{C}_{(1)}$ *denote the subset of classes* $[a,b] \in \mathcal{C}$ *for which the condition* $\mathrm{GCD}(p+q, a+b) = 1$ *is satisfied. Then both* $\mathcal{C}_{(1)}$ *and its complement in* $\mathcal{C}$ *are non-empty.*

Proof. If $a = p$ and $b = q-1$ then $\mathrm{GCD}(p+q, a+b) = 1$. Also, $\tau(p, q-1) = \frac{2p}{p+q}$, which is in $[-\tau_M, \tau_M] \cap \frac{2k}{n}\mathbb{Z}$. Thus $[p, q-1]$ is in $\mathcal{C}_{(1)}$. It is similarly straightforward to see that $(p,q) = (0,0)$ defines an element in $\mathcal{C} - \mathcal{C}_{(1)}$, as does $(p,q) = (p,-p)$ if $p \leqslant q$ or $(p,q) = (q,-q)$ if $q \leqslant p$. □

It seems somewhat complicated to go beyond this result and completely enumerate the elements in $\mathcal{C}_{(1)}$. The following result is, however, a step in that direction.

Definition 10.7. *Let* $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}$ *be the region bounded by*

- *the ray* $b = q$ *and* $a \leqslant p$*,*

- *the ray* $a = p$ *and* $b \leqslant q$,
- *the ray* $a = 0$ *and* $b \leqslant 0$,
- *the ray* $b = 0$ *and* $a \leqslant 0$,
- *the line* $aq - bp = np(g-1)$, *and*
- *the line* $aq - bp = -np(g-1)$,

and including all the boundary lines except the first two rays. Let $\Omega_{\mathbb{Z}}$ *be the set of integer points in* Ω, *i.e.* $\Omega_{\mathbb{Z}} = \Omega \bigcap \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}$. *We refer to* $\Omega_{\mathbb{Z}}$ *as the* **fundamental region for** (p, q).

Proposition 10.8. *Suppose that* p *and* q *are integers with* $\mathrm{GCD}(p, q) = k$ *and* $p \leqslant q$[5].

1. *There is a bijection between* $\mathcal{C}$ *and* $\Omega_{\mathbb{Z}}$.
2. *If* (a, b) *lies in* $\Omega_{\mathbb{Z}}$ *then* $d = a + b$ *satisfies the bounds*
$$-n(g-1) \leqslant d < n \ . \tag{10.4}$$
All values of d *in this range occur.*
3. *Let* l_t *denote the line* $aq - bp = tk$. *Then the points on* $l_t \bigcap \Omega_{\mathbb{Z}}$ *define the locus of points* (a, b) *for which* $\tau(a, b) = t\frac{2k}{n}$.
4. *The line* l_t *intersects* $\Omega_{\mathbb{Z}}$ *for* $-\frac{np}{k}(g-1) \leqslant t \leqslant \frac{np}{k}(g-1)$ *For each integer* t *in this range, there are* k *points on* $l_t \bigcap \Omega_{\mathbb{Z}}$.
5. *For a fixed* t, *all integer points* $(a, b) \in l_t \bigcap \Omega_{\mathbb{Z}}$ *have the same* $\mathrm{GCD}(d, \frac{n}{k})$, *where* $d = a + b$.
6. *If* $\mathrm{GCD}(d, \frac{n}{k}) \neq 1$ *then* $\mathrm{GCD}(d', n) \neq 1$ *for all* $(a', b') \in l_t \bigcap \Omega_{\mathbb{Z}}$.

Proof. (1) Suppose first that $\frac{a}{p} \leqslant \frac{b}{p}$. Pick l such that $0 \leqslant a + lp \leqslant p$. Then $b + lq \leqslant q$, so that $(a + lp, b + lq)$ is in the fundamental region. Similarly, if $\frac{a}{p} \geqslant \frac{b}{p}$ then we pick l such that $0 \leqslant b + lq \leqslant q$ and see that $a + lp \leqslant p$. In this way we get a well defined map from $\mathcal{C}$ to the fundamental region. The map is clearly injective. To see that it is surjective, notice that the boundary lines $aq - bp = np(g-1)$, and $aq - bp = -np(g-1)$ correspond to the conditions $\tau = \tau_M$ and $\tau = -\tau_M$ respectively.

---

[5] With an analogous Proposition for the case $p \geqslant q$.

(2) This is clear from a sketch of the fundamental region. In such a sketch, the loci of points with constant value of $d = a + b$ are straight lines of slope -1. Since $p \leqslant q$, the extreme cases are those of the lines passing through the points $(0, -n(g-1)$ and (p, q). Using the points $(0, b)$ with $-n(g-1) \leqslant b < q$ we get points at which all values of d in the range $-n(g-1) \leqslant d < q$ are realized. We get values of d in the range $g \leqslant d < n$ at the points $(a, q-1)$, with $1 \leqslant a < p$.

(3)-(4) This is simply a re-statement of Proposition 10.1.

(5)-(6) Both follow from the fact that for any two points (a, b) and (a', b') on l_t, we get $d' = d + s\frac{n}{k}$ for some $s \in \mathbb{Z}$. ☐

Remark 10.9. There is no converse to (6), i.e. it is possible to have $\mathrm{GCD}(d', n) \neq 1$ for some $(a', b') \in l_t \bigcap \Omega_{\mathbb{Z}}$, even if $\mathrm{GCD}(d, \frac{n}{k}) = 1$. For example, take $p = 2, q = 4, a = -1, b = 0, a' = 0, b' = 2$, and $t = -2$. Then $\mathrm{GCD}(d', n) = 2$ but $\mathrm{GCD}(d, \frac{n}{k}) = 1$.

10.3 Moduli spaces of $\mathrm{U}(p, q)$-Higgs bundles

In this section we give our main results on the moduli spaces of $\mathrm{U}(p, q)$-Higgs bundles. As noted several times before, the results are conveniently stated using the Toledo invariant $\tau(a, b) = 2(qa - pb)/(p + q)$. For completeness we recall from Remark 3.23 that the maximal value of the Toledo invariant is $\tau_M = \min\{p, q\}(2g - 2)$. In the case $p = q$ these definitions simplify to $\tau = a - b$ and $\tau_M = p(2g - 2)$.

Recall from Proposition 3.15 that, whenever the moduli space $\mathcal{M}^s(a, b)$ of stable $\mathrm{U}(p, q)$-Higgs bundles with invariants (a, b) is non-empty, it is a smooth complex manifold of dimension $1 + (p + q)^2(g - 1)$. We shall refer to this dimension as the *expected dimension* in the following.

Theorem 10.10. *Let (a, b) be such that $\tau(a, b) = 0$, then $\mathcal{M}(a, b)$ is non-empty and connected.*

Proof. It follows from (1) in Proposition 5.12, applied to the triples in $\mathcal{N}(a, b)$, that if $\tau = 0$ then $\frac{a}{p} = \frac{b}{q}$. The result is thus simply a re-statement of (3) in Theorems 5.11 and 5.9 (plus the non-emptiness of the moduli spaces $M(p, a)$ and $M(q, b)$). ☐

Remark 10.11. It is not clear if $\mathcal{M}^s(a, b)$ is non-empty. Notice that the minimal subvariety is $\mathcal{N}(a, b) = M(p, a) \times M(q, b)$, in which every element is reducible. To show that strictly stable points exist we must look beyond the minima. We observe though, that if it is non-empty, then $\mathcal{M}^s(a,b)$ is a smooth connected manifold of the expected dimension.

Theorem 10.12. *Let* (a,b) *be such that* $0 < |\tau(a,b)| < \tau_M$. *Then the closure* $\bar{\mathcal{M}}^s(a,b)$ *of the moduli space of stable* $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$*-Higgs bundles with fixed invariant* (a,b) *is connected. Moreover, the stable locus* $\mathcal{M}^s(a,b)$ *is a smooth non-empty manifold of the expected dimension.*

Proof. If $p \neq q$, from (2) of Proposition 5.12 we have that $2g-2 < \alpha_M$ and therefore Theorem 8.9 shows that $\mathcal{N}^s_{2g-2}$ is non-empty and irreducible. If $p = q$, Theorem 9.14 shows that $\mathcal{N}^s_{2g-2}$ is non-empty and irreducible. From this we draw two conclusions. Firstly, we see from (1) and (2) of Theorem 5.11 that $\bar{\mathcal{M}}^s(a,b)$ is connected. Secondly, it follows that $\mathcal{M}^s(a,b)$ is a smooth non-empty manifold of the expected dimension. ☐

Theorem 10.13. *Let* $p = q$ *and let* (a,b) *be such that* $|\tau(a,b)| = \tau_M$. *Then* $\mathcal{M}(a,b)$ *is non-empty and connected. Moreover,* $\mathcal{M}^s(a,b)$ *is non-empty, and smooth of the expected dimension.*

Proof. Since $p = q$, the Toledo invariant is $\tau = a - b$. Suppose for definiteness that $a > b$. Since, by hypothesis, $a - b = \tau_M = p(2g-2)$, the moduli space of triples $\mathcal{N}_{2g-2}(p,p,b+p(2g-2),a)$ is simply $\mathcal{N}_{2g-2}(p,p,a,a)$, which by Corollary 9.2 is irreducible. Now, by (2) in Theorem 5.11, we have that $\mathcal{M}(a,b)$ is connected. A similar argument applies if $a < b$. ☐

If $p \neq q$ then Theorem 3.26 gives a description of $\mathcal{M}(a,b)$ when (a,b) is such that $|\tau(a,b)| = \tau_M$. For definiteness, assume that $p < q$ and $\tau(a,b) = \tau_M$. Then, using the more precise notation $\mathcal{M}(p,q,a,b)$ for the moduli space of semistable $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$-Higgs bundles with topological invariant (a,b), Proposition 3.26 gives

- $\mathcal{M}(p,q,a,b) \cong \mathcal{M}(p,p,a,a-p(2g-2)) \times M(q-p, b-a+p(2g-2))$, where $M(q-p, b-a+p(2g-2))$ is the moduli space of polystable bundles of degree $q-p$ and rank $b-a+p(2g-2)$.
- The dimension at a smooth point in $\mathcal{M}(p,q,a,b)$ is $2 + (p^2 + 5q^2 - 2pq)(g-1)$, and it is hence strictly smaller than the expected dimension.
- Every element in $\mathcal{M}(p,q,a,b)$ is strictly semistable, i.e. $\mathcal{M}^s(a,b)$ is empty.

Similar statements hold for $p > q$ and/or $\tau = -\tau_M$. We can now add:

Theorem 10.14. *Let* $p \neq q$ *and let* (a, b) *be such that* $|\tau(a, b)| = \tau_M$. *Then* $\mathcal{M}(a, b)$ *is non-empty and connected.*

Proof. This follows from (1) and (2) of Theorem 5.11 and Corollary 8.2. ☐

Theorem 10.15. *Let* (a, b) *be such that* $|\tau(a, b)| \leqslant \tau_M$, *and suppose moreover that* $\mathrm{GCD}(p + q, a + b) = 1$. *Then* $\mathcal{M}(a, b)$ *is a non-empty, connected, smooth manifold of the expected dimension.*

Proof. Under the condition $\mathrm{GCD}(p + q, a + b) = 1$ there are no strictly semi-stable $\mathrm{U}(p, q)$-Higgs bundles and hence $\mathcal{M}(a, b)^s = \mathcal{M}(a, b)$ (cf. Remark 3.13).

Note also that the condition $\mathrm{GCD}(p+q, a+b) = 1$ excludes the possibility $\tau = 0$ and, when $p \neq q$, the possibility $|\tau| = \tau_M$ (by Proposition 3.26). Hence we have, in fact, that $0 < |\tau| \leqslant \tau_M$ and, when $p \neq q$, that $0 < |\tau| < \tau_M$.

Thus the statement is immediate from the preceding Theorems. ☐

In the case $p = q$ and $(p - 1)(2g - 2) < |\tau| \leqslant \tau_M$ we do not need to impose any coprimality conditions in order to prove connectedness of the moduli spaces $\mathcal{M}(a, b)$. This follows from the fact that in this situation no flips are required to go from $\mathcal{N}_L$ to $\mathcal{N}_{2g-2}$. Thus we have the following.

Theorem 10.16. *Assume that* $p = q$ *and that* $\tau = a - b$ *is such that*

$$(p - 1)(2g - 2) < |\tau| \leqslant \tau_M = p(2g - 2),$$

then $\mathcal{M}(a, b)$ *is non-empty and connected.*

Proof. For definiteness let us assume that $a > b$ (an analogous argument applies to $a < b$). We must then prove the connectedness of the moduli space of ($2g - 2$-polystable) triples $\mathcal{N}_{2g-2}(p, p, a + p(2g - 2), b)$ Recall from (7.15) that

$$\alpha_0 = d_1 - d_2 = a - b + p(2g - 2).$$

Since, by hypothesis, $a - b > (p - 1)(2g - 2)$ we have that $2g - 2 > \alpha_0$. We thus have that $\mathcal{N}_{2g-2}(p, p, a + p(2g - 2), b)$ is non-empty and irreducible by Theorem 9.14, and hence $\mathcal{M}(a, b)$ is connected by Theorem 5.11. ☐

Remark 10.17. The connectedness part of Theorem 10.16 is a result previously proved by Markman and Xia [26].

10.4 Moduli spaces of $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$ and $\mathrm{PU}(p,q)$ representations

In this section we finally give our results on the moduli spaces of representations. We begin by translating the results of Section 10.3 into results about the moduli spaces of $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$ representations via Proposition 3.12. We denote by $\bar{\mathcal{R}}^*_\Gamma(a,b)$ the closure of $\mathcal{R}^*_\Gamma(a,b)$ in $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(a,b)$.

Theorem 10.18. *Let (a,b) be such that $|\tau(a,b)| \leqslant \tau_M$. Unless further restrictions are imposed, let (p,q) be any pair of positive integers.*

(1) *If either of the following sets of conditions apply, then the moduli space $\mathcal{R}^*_\Gamma(a,b)$ of irreducible semi-simple representations, is a non-empty, smooth manifold of the expected dimension, with connected closure $\bar{\mathcal{R}}^*_\Gamma(a,b)$:*

   (*i*) $0 < |\tau(a,b)| < \tau_M$,

   (*ii*) $|\tau(a,b)| = \tau_M$ *and* $p = q$

(2) *If any one of the following sets of conditions apply, then the moduli space $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(a,b)$ of all semi-simple representations is non-empty and connected:*

   (*i*) $\tau(a,b) = 0$,

   (*ii*) $|\tau(a,b)| = \tau_M$ *and* $p \neq q$. ,

   (*iii*) $(p-1)(2g-2) < |\tau| \leqslant \tau_M = p(2g-2)$ *and* $p = q$,

   (*iv*) $\mathrm{GCD}(p+q, a+b) = 1$

(3) *If $|\tau(a,b)| = \tau_M$ and $p \neq q$ then any representation in $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(a,b)$ is reducible (i.e. $\mathcal{R}^*_\Gamma(a,b)$ is empty). If $p < q$, then any such representation decomposes as a direct sum of a semisimple representation of Γ in $\mathrm{U}(p,p)$ with maximal Toledo invariant and a semisimple representation in $\mathrm{U}(q-p)$. Thus, if $\tau = p(2g-2)$ then there is an isomorphism*

$$\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(p,q,a,b) \cong \mathcal{R}_\Gamma(p,p,a,a-p(2g-2)) \times R_\Gamma(q-p, b-a+p(2g-2)),$$

where the notation $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(p,q,a,b)$ indicates the moduli space of representations of Γ in $\mathrm{U}(p,q)$ with invariants (a,b), and $R_\Gamma(n,d)$ denotes the moduli space of degree d representations of Γ in $\mathrm{U}(n)$. (A similar result holds if $p > q$, as well as if $\tau = -p(2g-2)$).

(4) *If* $\mathrm{GCD}(p+q, a+b) = 1$ *then* $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma(a,b)$ *is a smooth manifold of the expected dimension.*

From Theorem 10.18 and Proposition 2.2 we finally obtain the following theorem about the moduli spaces of $\mathrm{PU}(p,q)$ representations. Note that the closure $\bar{\mathcal{R}}^*[a,b]$ in $\mathcal{R}[a,b]$ is the image of $\bar{\mathcal{R}}^*_\Gamma(a,b)$ under the map of Proposition 2.2, hence these two spaces have the same number of connected components.

Theorem 10.19. *Let* (a,b) *be such that* $|\tau(a,b)| \leqslant \tau_M$*. Unless further restrictions are imposed, let* (p,q) *be any pair of positive integers.*

(1) *If either of the following sets of conditions apply, then the moduli space* $\mathcal{R}^*[a,b]$ *of irreducible semi-simple representations, is non-empty, with connected closure* $\bar{\mathcal{R}}^*[a,b]$*:*

  (*i*) $0 < |\tau(a,b)| < \tau_M$,

  (*ii*) $|\tau(a,b)| = \tau_M$ *and* $p = q$

(2) *If any one of the following sets of conditions apply, then the moduli space* $\mathcal{R}[a,b]$ *of all semi-simple representations is non-empty and connected:*

  (*i*) $\tau(a,b) = 0$,

  (*ii*) $|\tau(a,b)| = \tau_M$ *and* $p \neq q$. ,

  (*iii*) $(p-1)(2g-2) < |\tau| \leqslant \tau_M = p(2g-2)$ *and* $p = q$,

  (*iv*) $\mathrm{GCD}(p+q, a+b) = 1$

(3) *If* $|\tau(a,b)| = \tau_M$ *and* $p \neq q$ *then any representation in* $\mathcal{R}[a,b]$ *is reducible (i.e.* $\mathcal{R}^*[a,b]$ *is empty). If* $p < q$*, then any such representation reduces to a semisimple representation of* $\pi_1 X$ *in* $\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{U}(p,p) \times \mathrm{U}(q-p))$*, such that the representation in* $\mathrm{PU}(p,p)$ *induced via projection on the first factor has maximal Toledo invariant. (A similar result holds if* $p > q$*, as well as if* $\tau = -p(2g-2)$*).*

□

Remark 10.20. As explained by Hitchin in [23, Section 5], the moduli space of irreducible representations in the adjoint form of a Lie group is liable to acquire singularities, because of the existence of stable vector bundles which are fixed under the action of tensoring by a finite order linebundle. For this reason we are not making any smoothness statements in Theorem 10.19.

References

[1] Álvarez-Cónsul, L., García-Prada, O.: Dimensional reduction, SL$(2,\mathbb{C})$-equivariant bundles and stable holomorphic chains. Int. J. Math. **12**, 159–201 (2001).

[2] Álvarez-Cónsul, L., García-Prada, O.: Dimensional reduction and quiver bundles. J. Reine Angew. Math., to appear.

[3] Atiyah, M. F., Bott, R.: The Yang-Mills equations over Riemann surfaces. Philos. Trans. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A **308**, 523–615 (1982).

[4] Banfield, D.: Stable pairs and principal bundles. Q. J. Math. **5**1, 417–436 (2000).

[5] Biswas, I., Ramanan, S.: An infinitesimal study of the moduli of Hitchin pairs. J. London Math. Soc. (2) **49**, 219–231 (1994).

[6] Bradlow, S. B., García-Prada, O.: Stable triples, equivariant bundles and dimensional reduction. Math. Ann. **304**, 225–252 (1996).

[7] Bradlow, S. B., García-Prada, O., Gothen P. B.: Representations of the fundamental group of a surface in PU(p,q) and holomorphic triples. C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris, **333** 347–352 (2001).

[8] Bradlow, S. B., García-Prada, O., and Mundet i Rierra, I. Relative Hitchin–Kobayashi correspondences for principal pairs. Preprint.

[9] Brambila–Paz, L., Grzegorczyk, I., Newstead, P.E.: Geography of Brill–Noether loci for small slopes. J. Algebraic Geometry **6** 645–669 (1997).

[10] Corlette, K.: Flat G-bundles with canonical metrics. J. Differential Geom. **28**, 361–382 (1988).

[11] Domic, A., Toledo, D.: The Gromov norm of the Kaehler class of symmetric domains. Math. Ann. **276**, 425–432 (1987).

[12] Donaldson, S. K.: Twisted harmonic maps and the self-duality equations. Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **55**, 127–131 (1987).

[13] Dupont, J. L.: Bounds for characteristic numbers of flat bundles. In: Dupont, J. L., Madsen, I. (eds.), Algebraic topology, Aarhus 1978, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 763, pp. 109–119. Berlin: Springer, 1978.

[14] Frankel, T.: Fixed points and torsion on Kähler manifolds. Ann. of Math. (2) **70**, 1–8 (1959).

[15] García-Prada, O.: Dimensional reduction of stable bundles, vortices and stable pairs. Int. J. Math. **5**, 1–52 (1994).

[16] García-Prada, O., Ramanan, S.: In preparation.

[17] Goldman, W. M.: Topological components of spaces of representations. Invent. Math. **93**, 557–607 (1988).

[18] Gothen, P. B.: The topology of Higgs bundle moduli spaces. Ph.D. thesis, Mathematics Institute, University of Warwick (1995).

[19] Gothen, P. B.: Components of spaces of representations and stable triples. Topology **40**, 823–850 (2001).

[20] Gothen, P. B., King, A. D.: Homological algebra of quiver bundles. Preprint, `arXiv:math.AG/0202033`

[21] Hernández, R.: On Harder-Narasimhan stratification over Quot schemes. J. Reine Angew. Math. **371**, 115–124 (1986).

[22] Hernández, L.: Maximal representations of surface groups in bounded symmetric domains. Transactions Amer. Math. Soc. **324**, 405–420 (1991).

[23] Hitchin, N. J.: The self-duality equations on a Riemann surface. Proc. London Math. Soc. **55**, 59–126 (1987).

[24] Hitchin, N. J.: Lie groups and Teichmüller space. Topology **31**, 449–473 (1992).

[25] Le Potier, J.: Fibrés vectoriels sur les courbes algébriques. Publications Mathématiques de l'Université Paris 7 - Denis Diderot (1991).

[26] Markman, E., Xia, E. Z.: The moduli of flat $\mathrm{PU}(p,p)$ structures with large Toledo invariants (2001). Preprint, `arXiv:math.AG/0009203 v2`.

[27] Mundet i Riera, I.: A Hitchin–Kobayashi correspondence for Kahler fibrations. J. Reine Angew. Math. **(**528) 41–80 (2000).

[28] Narasimhan, M. S., Seshadri, C. S.: Stable and unitary bundles on a compact Riemann surface. Ann. of Math., **82**, 540–564 (1965).

[29] Nitsure, N.: Moduli spaces of semistable pairs on a curve. Proc. London Math. Soc. **62**, 275–300 (1991).

[30] Schmitt, A.: A universal construction for the moduli spaces of decorated vector bundles. Habilitationsschrift, University of Essen, (2000).

[31] Simpson, C. T.: Constructing variations of Hodge structure using Yang-Mills theory and applications to uniformization. J. Amer. Math. Soc. **1**, 867–918 (1988).

[32] Simpson, C. T.: Higgs bundles and local systems. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. **75**, 5–95 (1992).

[33] Simpson, C. T.: Moduli of representations of the fundamental group of a smooth projective variety I. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. **79**, 867–918 (1994).

[34] Simpson, C. T.: Moduli of representations of the fundamental group of a smooth projective variety II. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. **80**, 5–79 (1994).

[35] Thaddeus, M.: Stable pairs, linear systems and the Verlinde formula. Invent. Math. **117**, 317–353 (1994).

[36] Toledo, D.: Representations of surface groups in complex hyperbolic space. J. Differential Geometry **29**, 125–133 (1989).

[37] Xia, E. Z.: Components of $\mathrm{Hom}(\pi_1, \mathrm{PGL}(2, \mathbf{R}))$. Topology **36**, 481–499 (1997).

[38] Xia, E. Z.: The moduli of flat $\mathrm{U}(p, 1)$ structures on Riemann surfaces (1999). Preprint, `arXiv:math.AG/9910037`.

[39] Xia, E. Z.: The moduli of flat $\mathrm{PU}(2, 1)$ structures over Riemann surfaces. Pacific Journal of Mathematics **195**, 231–256 (2000).